THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'THE problem of human sin is no longer regarded by the more practical type of humanity as something aloof and objective. Evil has descended upon us like an avalanche in its most horrible form; and those who might once have regarded "evil" as an almost academic term now realize that it is something deep-seated in the human mind and heart—that can victimize whole nations and threaten civilization with destruction.'

These words appear on the publishers' 'jacket' to the most recent volume, as we suppose, of 'The Christian Challenge Series' (Centenary Press; 3s. 6d. net). The volume is entitled *The Mastery of Evil*, and the author is Canon Roger LLOYD of Winchester.

The words we have quoted are largely true. None the less it should be remembered that since the beginning the Christian religion has presented an attitude to evil which is by no means merely 'objective' or 'academic.' No doubt the problem of evil early won the attention of Christian theologians; and Christian theology offers a classical solution not only of the problem of universal sin but also of the problem of sin's origin. But already in the New Testament pages evil is regarded from a practical rather than theoretical standpoint. It is not so much a problem to be solved as a challenge to be met. In the Christian life the 'world' is to be 'overcome.'

Canon LLOYD appreciates this point; and indeed *The Mastery of Evil* is a happy title for a work which sounds so truly the note of the Christian religion. It is the modern counterpart of what the New Testament might have called 'the overcoming of the world.' It is a reminder that all down the centuries the Christian life, when truly lived, has been a challenge, a battle-cry, nay a victory.

In this vigorous little book Canon LLOYD is nothing if not topical, and Nihilism—for which he affirms that Hitler and Stalin stand—is handled with knowledge and insight. He insists that the Nihilistic denial of Truth leads to the undoing of the work of Christ both for society and for man.

The most distinctive chapters of the work are ruled by the conception of tragedy. In the first of them—they are three in number—he points out that, in their perplexity with life, many are driven back upon tragedy as an interpreting principle. As they can find no cosmic meaning in life, they look hopefully for an ethical meaning.

But, while tragedy interprets the purpose of life as the purging of the evil (but at what an enormous cost!), its God is destiny and its religion fatalism. Hamlet was not really free 'to be or not to be.'

In the second of the three chapters under review the tragic drama of to-day is represented as the conflict between democracy and totalitarianism, and for the last named—as for tragedy—the only religion is fatalism. And here also fatalism, under the guise of historical destiny, is as much an explosive as an anodyne.

But if history has any meaning at all, destiny is the perfected civilization, and is not properly thought of—in the totalitarian fashion—as affecting

the smaller groups of mankind, such as classes or nations. 'It is nonsense to take history and build upon it a case which produces a destiny for Germany, Italy, Japan, or Russia, and which can only propose for other nations and classes within the same group the task of a slavish subservience to them.'

Further, from the Christian point of view destiny is real, but it is bound up with the action of God. Only in the gospel of Jesus Christ can the moralist stand on firm ground. For 'his problem is so to face the facts of evil as to wring from them a reasoned hope and a sure faith in the victory of good and in the power of man to escape from his prison of circumstance.'

Which brings us to the last of our three chapters, in which the conception of tragedy is set in the light of the Christian gospel. The gospel story is itself a tragedy, but the difference between it and Shakespearian tragedy is that the evil is not visibly, although it is spiritually, destroyed within the action of the drama. Moreover, the story of Jesus Christ is a tragedy with fate left out, and God inserted in its place; which makes tragedy tolerable. Accepting the tragic interpretation of life, the gospel rejects the 'brooding fatalism' of tragedy.

For the elaboration of these and other points we must refer the reader to Canon LLOYD'S thoughtful and timely pages.

An acute, scholarly, and practical book on the Gospel miracles has been written by the Rev. Alan RICHARDSON, B.D., the study secretary of the Student Christian Movement, and examining chaplain to the Bishops of Newcastle and Sheffield—*The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The claim of the jacket that the writer makes here 'a fresh approach' to the question of the miracles may not be entirely valid, but at any rate his book is both individual and suggestive, and makes a particular appeal to the working clergyman.

The main idea in the book is that the significance of the Gospel miracles lies in their *meaning*. They contain the theology of the Early Church and were the means of the instruction of converts in the truth of it. The miracle-stories 'formed a characteristic part of the pedagogic technique of the earliest Christian missionaries.' They have a definite place in the total theological scheme of the New Testament. Mr. RICHARDSON contends that the problem of the miraculous cannot be solved, as the Ritschlian movement tried to solve it, by a purely historical inquiry, because they cannot be detached from their theological background and purpose. The time has come, the writer believes, to make a fresh effort to view the miracle-stories in relation to the purpose of the New Testament writings as a whole, and of the Gospels in particular.

They are not 'wonder' stories. They were not told for their evidential value (which, indeed, is a purely modern idea). Neither were they told to illustrate the compassion of Jesus. The Evangelists are not interested in the motives of Jesus, about which they maintain a consistent and reverent silence. They lived in an age unaffected by the humanistic approach and the modern humanitarian attitude. In that age humanitarian emotion was counted as a weakness rather than as a virtue.

Nor can the Gospel miracles be regarded as examples of faith-healing. The modern use of the word 'faith' in the psychological sense has little in common with the faith of which the Gospel-writers speak; that is, a saving, personal, believing relationship with Christ. The modern mind which professes to find belief in the healing work of Jesus easier on account of the successes of modern psychotherapy is still a long way removed from the New Testament faith in Christ the Saviour.

It must be grasped clearly that the object of the miracle-stories is to awaken faith in the Person of Christ as the Word of God. His miracles were signs to those who had eyes to see. The prerequisite for understanding was that one's eyes should be opened to the central mystery of the gospel. There they could be perceived as the revelation of the

power of God. The interest of the stories centres in their theological rather than in their historical character. They are neither the 'reminiscences' of eye-witnesses, nor 'tales' told by an order of story-tellers, as Form Critics suggest. Their motive is neither biographical nor literary; they are the materials used by Christian preachers in their presentation of the gospel.

The *raison d'être*, therefore, of the miracle-stories was *teaching*, and teaching about Jesus. Mr. RICHARDSON deals with this point at great length and with many examples. Jesus confronted men and women with the challenge which was involved in His acts of power. It was not merely that He compelled men to acknowledge that He had the power to make lame men walk. He asked them by the same token to believe that He had authority to forgive sins. He not merely opened the eyes of blind men, but claimed by that sign the power to make men see the truth of God. He not merely healed the lepers, the diseased, and the impotent, but demonstrated thereby His ability to break the power of sin and to enable men to fulfil the works of the Law. He not merely fed hungry men in the desert, but claimed by that sign to be the dispenser of the spiritual food by which souls are nourished in their pilgrimage. And, finally, He not merely raised a child or a man from the dead, but claimed by doing so to be the resurrection and the life.

It is only after a prolonged exposition of this main theme that Mr. RICHARDSON faces the question: Did the miracles really happen? In modern times this has been thought to be a question of historical evidence and metaphysical possibility. The writer takes a different view. To begin with, he points out that history, in the sense of historical writing, is not merely a chronicle of events. It is a matter of selection and interpretation of facts. And that is what we have in the Gospels. The Evangelists are not chroniclers. They have not attempted to catalogue all that Jesus said and did. They are content to give us those facts which seem to them to be essential to the understanding of who Jesus is.

They are historians who have selected their facts and given to these their interpretation, with the result that, if we do not accept their interpretation, we become sceptical about the very possibility of knowledge of the facts themselves. Fact and interpretation are indissoluble. The history which the Evangelists write is their gospel. If we accept their gospel, we accept the history which they record. If we reject that gospel, we shall inevitably reject the view that Jesus performed miracles, or we shall seek to explain them away by means of the hypothesis of faith-healing or other modern theories equally removed from the standpoint of the Biblical theology.

Christ is to the New Testament writers the manifestation of the power of God in the world, and His mighty deeds are the signs of the effectual working of that power. It is possible for us to fail to see this in Christ; then we shall be content with an explanation of the miracle-stories in terms of modern psychology or folk-mythology. The miracle-stories, as an essential part of the preaching of Apostolic Christianity, confront us with the question whether the power of God was or was not revealed in the Person and work of Jesus Christ. They compel us to say Yes or No.

That is why any discussion of the Gospel miracles must begin, as this book begins, with a consideration of the Biblical theology, with the faith which illuminates their character and purpose. And thus the answer to the question: Did the miracles happen? is always a *personal* answer. It is not the judgment of a historian *qua* scientific investigator. It is the 'yes' of faith to the challenge which confronts us in the New Testament presentation of Christ—the only Christ we can know. When we say 'yes' to the question about Christ we are assenting to the Apostolic claim that in Him the power of God was made manifest for our salvation.

But the writer retains one proviso. The 'yes' he asks does not mean that each recorded miracle-story is to be accepted 'by faith' on its face value. Our critical and historical faculties have their rights, and we must exercise them in respect of

the detail of each particular miracle-story. Our knowledge of Christ's individual acts of power has been mediated to us by a long process of the passing of the tradition from mouth to mouth before it came to be written down. In this process we can trace the motives guiding the tradition in this or that direction, but we are sure that we are in close touch with the living faith of the men who first loved to tell the story. And we can be sure, in spite of uncertainty about details, that the power of God was manifest to those who witnessed the act of the Lord. Thus we can affirm both the value and the limits of the historical criticism of the Gospels.

But, whatever that value and these limits may be, the first necessity is to penetrate the incognito of Jesus and to see behind the Jesus of Galilee the Christ of the New Testament faith. Then the miracle-stories speak to us of the gracious dealings of Christ with our sick and hungry and tormented souls, and the ancient power of Christ which they reveal is found by faith to be available still to those who but touch the hem of His garment.

An excellent little handbook has been published with the apt title of *The Ten Commandments in the 20th Century*, by Mr. John DREWETT (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net). The Commandments are treated in a fresh and interesting way, being grouped under the headings of Worship, Family Relationships, Property, the Sanctity of Human Life, and Truth and Falsehood. The writer's view is that 'the Ten Commandments are again likely to become relevant to our situation because the whole world movement to-day is away from individualism towards community. The choice before us is a community based on force and external human authority—*i.e.* a secular totalitarian state such as exists in Germany and Russia—or a community based on respect for personality and held together by the authority of divine law.'

In a suggestive introductory chapter Mr. DREWETT deals with the question, 'Are the Commandments obsolete?' and offers three reasons why they seem to have fallen into disrepute in this twentieth century. The first reason is that in our time 'the emphasis has shifted from a negative attitude to human behaviour to a positive,' whereas the Commandments are almost exclusively negative. The second reason is 'the breakdown in the belief in an objective moral law. . . . This means that law becomes a matter of convenience and has no universal reality.' There is also a third reason which arises from the feeling prevalent among Christians of to-day that 'the teaching of Jesus goes so far beyond the law of Moses that the Law is no longer binding upon Christians. . . . The law of love, they say, is positive and is a creative force. If we really love our neighbour, we shall automatically keep all the Commandments.'

These reasons certainly have weight, and although they are here treated very briefly and are barely touched upon, they suggest matter of the greatest moral import. There would seem to be in our time an urgent duty to revive the concept of moral law and to strengthen respect for it.

It is true that the universal validity of the moral law is widely called in question, and any idea that its authority is rooted in the will of God is far removed from the popular mind. This breakdown of the belief in an objective moral law is surprising in view of the very great emphasis placed upon natural law. It might have been supposed that the modern mind, trained to regard the world as an orderly whole, would have insisted that law must reign in the moral realm as well as in the natural.

This would doubtless have been so if man were a purely rational being, but in fact, as all experience shows, he is oftener influenced by his passions and desires than by his reason. And one of his strongest passions is a passion for dominance or a 'will to power.' He is ardently ambitious to rule rather than to serve, to command rather than to obey. As soon as he awoke to consciousness of his powers he heard the tempter's voice saying, 'Ye shall be as gods,' and straightway he revolted against God to set up a kingdom of his own. Ever since then man has been, and still is, in a state of revolt.

Any psychology which ignores the fact that man is in revolt is vitiated from the start. And this criticism applies to a good deal of the psychology and educational theories of to-day. Certain educational systems clearly proceed on the assumption that the child mind is quite healthy and needs only nourishment, that its qualities are all innately good and only require to be encouraged to develop. But in point of fact, the problem is not one of simple and straightforward growth. If there is a worm at the root of the young plant, or if it is attacked by some disease, then remedial action is called for, and the wise husbandman will take drastic measures to ward off these dangers. Free self-expression and the development of personality are essential elements in education, but the personality may develop in a crooked direction and the self may find expression in ways that are harmful to itself and to the social order. Then the Law must utter its commandments with authority in order to define the limits of the permissible, and to restrain the would-be transgressor with its stern 'Thou shalt not.'

It is the prohibitive element in the Law which is specially distasteful to the modern mind, as indeed it has been to the human mind since the very first. And in our time ideals of freedom, equality, and self-government have made men peculiarly resentful of all forms of restraint. The ambition of the natural man is to be captain of his soul, master of his fate, and he will have no one, man or God, to rule over him. Any prohibition, divine or human, acts upon him as a challenge to assert his independence. The youth of to-day is disposed to revolt from the precepts and customs of the past. 'Why should I follow in the footsteps of the fathers, think as they thought, live as they lived? Why should I accept their word for it? Why not prove all things in my own experience? Why, in particular, should the Ten Commandments be a law binding upon me, seeing they were given to a pastoral people in ancient times when the complications of modern life were as yet undreamed of?'

This mood may be carried to a most foolish and harmful extreme. To think things out for oneself and put them to the proof of experience is an excellent discipline and the condition of all progress, but after all the moral law as expressed in its commands and prohibitions represents, to say the least of it, the accumulated experience of the ages. Surely it will be conceded that the human race has learned some wisdom by the thing it has suffered. Even from prehistoric ages men were painfully learning that fire burns and water drowns, that certain plants were poisonous and others wholesome. And one can imagine the anxious cave-mother warning her children to eat this and not to taste that. As the experience of the race grew and widened through the ages this practical wisdom accumulated, until now there is a vast body of knowledge laid up for our instruction. Certain things have been proved beyond all reasonable doubt, matters connected with personal and family life, with sex and property and general human well-being. The laws embodying these experiences we disregard at our peril.

It is our Christian belief that the moral law does not merely embody the accumulated experience of the human race but has its ultimate root in the will of God. It ought therefore never to be disparaged and set in opposition to Christian love. Love is the fulfilling of the law, not its abrogation. It is quite true that if we perfectly love our neighbour we shall do for him all that the law requires and more, but who among us has reached this degree of perfection, so that we can dispense with all moral rules? 'The Commandments are not meant to be a statement of the Christian ethic, nor are they the total duty expected of a Christian. We can keep them all and yet lack what is necessary for salvation. But they are a minimum obligation upon us. It is possible to distinguish between the rules of a game and the spirit of a game. You may keep all the rules and yet have a very unhappy game, because, as we say, the spirit was lacking. The Commandments are rules of life, but the Gospel supplies the spirit. We may have the right spirit, but if we don't keep the rules we shall not be able to play the game at all. Love goes beyond justice but it can never tolerate injustice, and Christian love, because it thinks justice a hard thing, often degenerates into a shallow sentimentality.'

Emperor Worship—Then and Now.

By Professor John Foster, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

> ' " Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." And so it is only to God that we make obeisance (προσκυνοῦμεν), while to you we gladly do service in other ways, acknowledging you kings and rulers of men, and praying that with kingly might you may be found to have also a judgment which is sound. But if you disregard our prayers. . . .'

That, from the first *Apology* of Justin,[1] is one of the great ' buts ' in the history of the Church. It is worthy in the new dispensation of being put alongside Dn $3^{17.\ 18}$ in the old :

> ' Our God whom we serve is able to deliver us ' (said Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego) ' but if not . . .'

As under Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon, as in the revived State-worship of imperial Rome, again in our day Caesar lays claim to that which can properly belong only to God. ' Church and State ' : the phrase makes us think of the cult of the State in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Some of us go on to think of our own hopes, vague yet and unexpressed (unless the launching of the World Council of the Churches just before the war be a beginning of such expression), hopes of a new order rising out of the present ruin, where Christian people shall find a loyalty transcending the international anarchy. . . . ' Church and State ' is no foreign problem, far-removed. While bearing in mind its relevance here, we shall consider chiefly one part of the Universal Church which is perhaps far removed, but which is facing this problem in its most acute form, and which in Christian charity demands our understanding and our prayers. As a teacher of Church History I am always trying to persuade people that the Younger Churches are (as indeed one might have expected) repeating some of the tremendous experiences of the Early Church. Nowhere in the world is there so clear a case for comparison of the modern crisis and the ancient conflict as in the Japanese Empire.

Any one entering Japanese territory has, added to the usual horrors of customs declarations, the task of making a list of all his books, with the name of the author of each, for police inspection. So carefully does the State seek to guard its people against the invasion of ' dangerous thoughts.' In the days when new missionaries were going out—before that turn in the tide which now seems to be bringing them home again—I used to tell my students that I hoped their lists would include some of the *Acta Martyrum*, *Apologies* like that of Justin and the still more outspoken one of Tertullian, other writings of the heroic period of the Church from the *Book of the Revelation* onwards. The inspector would not make a fuss about any of these—unless indeed one were so conscientious as to omit the author's name in the case of *The Revelation* ! He would not see their relevance. But the young missionary would. For to enter Japanese territory is to step back over the centuries to a land where Emperor worship is a living reality, and may at any time become a challenge confronting the Church.

Of course we must not assume that they are exactly parallel cases, or we shall prejudge the issue. But the trouble so far seems rather to have been that those who have provided material to help us make our judgment have done so apart from the background of history. It is always a mistake to act as though either human wisdom or divine guidance were beginning anew with ourselves. As Christians we must take into account the centuries of experience to which we are rightful heirs.

The very fussiness of the police already mentioned, will remind you of the parallel. In the Roman capital too the police system was thorough and efficient, keeping especial watch over (technically illicit) *collegia*.[2] From the provinces governors sent reports which are striking for the minute recording of all that might possibly affect the security of the State. If in every meeting in Japan there is the police spy, it was the same fear of ' dangerous thoughts ' which caused Roman Emperors to ban the most innocent of societies. Pliny was thinking of founding something like an Auxiliary Fire Service in the city of Nicomedeia. Trajan wrote back,

> ' Whatever name they bear, it is almost certain that men so united will become a political club. It will be better therefore to supply the necessary apparatus in case of fire, to warn the landlords to take precautions for themselves, and in case of necessity to make use of the populace in extinguishing the flames.' [3]

[1] xvii.

[2] E. G. Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Government*, 47 f.

[3] Quoted by T. R. Glover in *Christ in the Ancient World*, 31.

Give them the stirrup pumps and leave them to it! Fires are not so fearful as dangerous thoughts!

The year 248 was kept in Rome as the thousandth anniversary of the founding of the city, by the twins Romulus and Remus, sons by a human mother of Mars, the god of war. The year 1940 was kept in Japan as the two thousand six hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the Empire by Jimmu Tennō, who was the great-grandchild of Ninigi-no-Mikoto, who was the grandson of Amaterasu-Omikami, the goddess of the Sun.[1] If you do a little sum you will see that both legendary beginnings are within the same century. Both celebrations were somewhat overcast. In Rome it was a period of decline, as any one could see. The festival falls almost exactly in the middle of a period of seventy years when the Empire was ruled by the 'barrack-room Emperors.' There were twenty-three in all—that means an average reign of three years. Most of these military despots met a violent death at a rival's hand. In Japan it was the time when long-laid plans of imperial expansion on the mainland of Asia ought to have been realized. A desperate attempt was made to finish off the 'China incident' so that the Emperor might have a worthy report to make at the Grand Imperial Shrine of Ise. But the 'incident' dragged on, a steady drain of blood and treasure, a wound which would not heal.

Origen saw what was likely to result: Rome was in decline because the gods were angry; the gods of Rome were angry because they were neglected; they were neglected because Christians had for a generation been left to undisturbed progress:

> 'It is likely that the secure existence, as regards this world, enjoyed by believers now, will come to an end, since those who in every way slander the Word put down the present frequency of sedition to the crowd of believers, and to their not being warred against by the leaders as in the old days.'[2]

The advocates of renewed persecution were right at least in this—it had been the time of rapid growth in numbers.[3] Indeed it is in the writings of Origen that we find a confidence which, in spite of the high-sounding boasts of earlier Apologists—'We have left to you only the temples,' says Tertullian about the year 200—must be accounted new. After the forty years of peace (210–250), there appears, instead of the earlier idea of a not too long delayed destruction of this wicked world, the hope of the world's conversion. It has become the fashion with some recently to speak as though any this-worldly realization of the Kingdom of God were part of the discredited optimism of nineteenth-century liberalism. But what of this from the third century, not the nineteenth?

> 'It is evident that even the barbarians, when they yield obedience to the word of God, will become most obedient to the law, and most humane; and every form of worship will be destroyed except the religion of Christ, which will alone prevail. And indeed it will one day triumph, as its principles take possession of the minds of men more and more every day. . . . And what are we to expect, if not only a very few agree, as at present, but the whole of the Empire of Rome? . . . . If all the Romans . . . embrace the Christian faith . . . they will not war at all. . . . For men of God are assuredly the salt of the earth: they preserve the order of the world. . . .
>
> Afterwards he (Celsus) says: "If it were possible," implying that he thought it most desirable, "that all the inhabitants of Asia, Europe, and Libya, Greeks and Barbarians, all to the uttermost ends of the earth, were to come under one law. . . . Any one who thinks this possible, knows nothing." It would require careful consideration and lengthened argument to prove that it is not only possible, but certain, that all who are endowed with reason will come under one law.'[4]

Here we have left the hard sayings of Jewish apocalyptic, and have the Kingdom interpreted in terms of its coming triumph in—and even beyond—the Roman Empire.

In Japan the ten years ending in 1935 have seen an advance of 55 per cent. in the number of communicants of non-Roman churches.[5] Kagawa estimates that the rate of increase has gone far towards being doubled.[6] The 'Kingdom of God Movement' led by him in the years after the Jerusalem Meeting of 1928 played no small part in this. Growth in numbers meant growth in influence. And this brought increased attention from the government. Mention of 'Jerusalem 1928' reminds us of another factor: increasingly the Ecumenical Movement demonstrates the supra-national nature of the Church. The proposal to hold the next (1938) Meeting of the International Missionary Council in China caught the critical eye of Japanese officialdom. If in Asia, why not in Japan? In any case international relationships are not a recommendation to any government which seeks to develop extremes of national feeling.

[1] D. C. Holtom, *The National Faith of Japan*, 132.

[2] *Contra Celsum*, iii. 15.

[3] A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, ii. 10–17.

[4] *Contra Celsum*, viii. 68–70; see also iii. 29, 54, viii. 59.

[5] *Interpretative Statistical Survey of the World Mission.*

[6] *Christ and Japan*, 124.

Thus came the startling events of the autumn of 1940: The Salvation Army in Japan was forced to reorganize on a national basis. The Anglican Communion in Japan asked its American and British bishops to resign. Six other of the largest denominations came together to form a national church of Japan. And all was under pressure from without, pressure which came with the putting into effect of the Religious Bodies Law of 1939.[1] This pressure is not directly related to the State cult, but is one index of the increasing regimentation which Christians must expect. And another direction in which there is less and less room for exceptions to the national uniformity is at the shrines. In both these respects Christians for the most part have found submission possible so far. Will it continue to be so, or, as was the case in the Roman Empire of Origen's time, is something else ahead?

This is enough to show that there is room for a comparison. In the light of such comparison let us examine first the renewal of the State, and the part played by the revived State religion:

Some one whose racy style has since become well known has described the Japanese Renaissance at the end of the Tokugawa Shogunate in 1868 as 'the synthetic manufacture of a Great Power.'[2] Old Japan had added to her nucleus of native culture all those influences which had been wafted over from the great civilization of the mainland, China. New Japan was to adopt Western ways. This meant not only railways and dockyards, foreign-style buildings and frock coats. It meant centralized government instead of feudalism, national sentiment instead of clan loyalties, and beyond all this a programme of imperialist expansion—instead of previous self-centredness—which was to make Japan a Power. How was it to be done?

All the world knows how young Japanese were selected and sent abroad. Britain was her example in naval affairs for a modern code of law, for a parliamentary system. She looked to Germany for an army, modern medicine, and a written constitution. To France and to the United States she looked for other aspects of the new life upon which she was entering. In every case she chose that country where she believed the best of its kind was to be found, and adapted that best to fit her own need. But there remained one other question: the spirit behind it all, the *sanction* of the new society—where was that to be found? The first attempt to provide a State religion capable of affording such a sanction was by combining Buddhism and the old indigenous Nature-worship of Japan which is called Shinto. The official aim was set down so as to inspire 'reverence for the gods and love of country . . . the truth of Heaven and the way of humanity . . . respect for the Emperor and obedience to his will.'[3] Special attention should be given to the second half of each of these three clauses. It is this which later becomes detached.

In the year 1875 this composite religion was scrapped. There followed in 1882 the separation of Sect Shinto and Shrine Shinto. The first is counted a religion of Japan, along with Buddhism and Christianity, and, like them, comes under the care of the Government Department of Education (Bureau of Religion). The second is officially explained as an effort to maintain traditional national ritual as contributing to the national spirit. It comes under the Home Office (Bureau of Shrines).[4] This residuum of a religion—many Japanese would say that what remained is not a religion at all—is the State cultus.

In Rome too religion was sought as a sanction, to provide spirit for that body which had been formed by the unification of all the Mediterranean world under the rule of one city-state. Ancient society did not know a bond of union other than the religious: the sanction behind family life was to be found in the worship of ancestors; that behind the city-state in the worship of its tutelary gods. Rome as an Empire, an achievement of unity on a new scale, demanded a new religion at its back.

> 'Half with conscious aim, half driven on unconsciously by the tide of circumstances, the new empire set about creating a new religion. It showed extraordinary skill in constructing the new system out of the old.'[5]

Those words might equally well have been written to describe Roman Emperor worship *or* Japanese Shrine Shinto.

In 1911 instructions were issued by the Minister of Education that, on the occasion of festivals at the local shrine, neighbouring schools were to attend, 'to give expression to the true spirit of reverence . . . most important in establishing the foundations of national morality.' For some time enforcement or neglect of this instruction depended upon the attitude of local authorities. Not unnaturally watch was most strict where there were

[1] *New York Sun*, Oct. 20, 1940: *Japan Christian Quarterly*, xv. 315–326.

[2] Stephen King-Hall, *Western Civilization and the Far East*, 56.

[3] Quoted from regulations of 1872 by D. C. Holtom, *The National Faith of Japan*, 60.

[4] Holtom, *op. cit.*, 68.

[5] W. M. Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 191.

large non-assimilated sections of the population, *i.e.* in Formosa, Korea, and now in the puppet State of Manchu-kuo.[1]

The objects of reverence in the various shrines are as follows: Imperial ancestors of distinction—many of whom are legendary figures; emperors whose subjects in their lifetime rebelled; princes who for military exploits count as national heroes; subjects of exceptional patriotism; Nature-gods of old Shinto, who are counted as being imperial ancestors too, chief of these being Amaterasu-Omikami in the Grand Imperial Shrine at Ise. The purpose of these shrines is clearly stated to be to heighten national sentiment through reverence for the imperial house.

The Emperor, and reverence for him as symbol of the State, were similarly central in Roman State religion. In some parts of the Empire he was represented as an earthly manifestation of the god which was locally venerated. In Asia Minor an imperial cultus was set up with its own temples and priesthood, from 29 B.C. onwards. As if to explain—perhaps to excuse—the presence of the Emperor there, a shadowy being, Dea Roma, the spirit of Rome, was coupled with him as an object of worship. The State priesthood also served to supervise and control priesthoods of other religions in the locality. In Rome itself there was naturally a different approach—or rather a variety of different approaches: The divine ancestry of the Julian house was emphasized in one of the new temples set up by Augustus, to Venus Genetrix.[2] More important as an influence upon future attitudes was his setting up of the *genius* of the Emperor as central in the street shrines (*lares compitales*) throughout the city. Dead Emperors were afforded divine honours by vote of the Senate, a proceeding which seems to us a strange commentary upon the meaning of divinity! However, Japan's list to-day, as seen in those former Emperors who are represented in the shrines, is similarly selective.

Holtom points out that we have here the 'extraordinary spectacle' of a modern State trying to strengthen its hold on politics and society by use of a Nature myth which belongs to the childhood of the race. The myth is that of the imperial family's descent from the Sun-Goddess, herself the daughter of the Sky-Father and Earth-Mother. 'The Emperor is sacred and inviolable,' says Article III. of the Japanese Constitution. 'The sacred throne, transmitted through an unbroken line . . . is immutable as the Heavens and the Earth,' says Prince Ito in commentary upon it. School texts base the national history upon this myth, and make it central in civics: 'We look up to the Emperor,' says one of the national readers, 'even as to God.'

Perhaps one might say that if in Britain we left the various denominations of the Christian Church untouched, but selected from among them that reversion to primitive tribal conceptions of the Deity, known as British Israelitism, and made that the State religion, we should be near the mark. To complete the nightmare one would have to imagine Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's, and other historic churches throughout the country separated for this use, with compulsory pilgrimages to them on Empire Day, Armistice Day, the King's Birthday, and so forth. Moreover, this fantasy would be foisted upon India, and upon the colonies, even though they not only had no interest in the British race as the Peculiar People, but had no connexion with any form of that religion by misuse of whose mythology the doctrine was being propagated.[3]

All this may sound so 'extraordinary' as to be without parallel in history. But the *genius* explanation, offered in Rome in attempt to rationalize the veneration of the Emperor as something less foreign to Roman ways than simple deification, was essentially similar. It too was a bit of animism descended from the childhood of the race—the guardian spirit which follows a man as closely as his shadow.

Japan's enforcement of attendance at shrine worship was, we saw, most zealous on the circumference of her empire. Rome's first compulsion was to be found in her Eastern provinces. Shrines to the Emperor here in Britain bring the thing nearer home. Tacitus tells us that one was set up at Colchester, 'that the citadel of Rome's overlordship may be beheld of men.'[4] Even so, modern Japanese would give a political rather than a religious explanation to the extension of their shrines to Formosa, Korea, Manchu-kuo—'that the New Order in East Asia may be beheld of men.'

Such is the part played by the State religion in the renewal of the State, and in the new imperialism which is its expression.

Without considering rights and wrongs, let us review facts concerning the relations of Christians with these State systems, in Rome then, and in Japan now: First I would ask you to note *Acts* 19[31],

[1] Here the shrines are 'Confucian' but one to the sun-goddess was dedicated after the Manchu 'Emperor' returned from Japan in 1940: the state cultus of the puppet must needs become that of the Empire which pulls the strings.

[2] G. F. Moore, *History of Religions*, i. 569.

[3] Compare King-Hall's analogy, connecting Adam and Eve by genealogical tree to the Royal Family, *op. cit.*, 287.

[4] *Annals*, XIV. xxxi. 6.

> 'And certain of the Asiarchs (R.V. margin) being his friends, besought him not to adventure himself into the theatre.'

These are none other than high-priests of Caesar-worship, *friends* of St. Paul! Their attitude shows nothing but concern for his safety, no intolerance, no idea yet of any rivalry, clash of loyalties, crisis of choice. Indeed, one would suspect, there was among them no particular enthusiasm for the worship of the Emperor as a religion. Evidently St. Paul found it possible to be on good terms with them as Roman citizens like himself, members of the same educated class. The opposition which had arisen at Ephesus was neither religious nor political, but rather commercial. Its leaders were not priests, nor Asiarchs, but tradesmen—silversmiths. But, remembering this incident as an instance of the Apostle's broadmindedness, we must also recall that Christians were not yet being compelled to go to the imperial shrines. They were still sheltered under the benefit of Jewish privilege.

The reign of the Emperor Domitian, 81–96, is marked by growing attention to the national cultus. (After his death, that which the senate voted him was not *consecratio* but *damnatio*!) '*Dominus et deus noster*' was how he loved to be hailed. He tried to claim for his person what others had been content to assert of their *genius*, to lay hold now on that which others hoped for at death. This is a generation later than Demetrius the silversmith. To see the changes which it brought to the Church in the city of Ephesus, one must turn to the *Book of the Revelation*, $17^{5.6}$. How distant seem the days when the Apostle fraternized with the high-priests of Caesar-worship! Rome is now

> 'Babylon the Great, the Mother of the harlots and of the abominations of the earth . . . drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.'

Yet Rome was never guilty of *religious* intolerance, and a Roman citizen might well have been amazed at such a charge. In the words of a legal expert,

> 'Where religion is incorporated into politics, any rebellion against the established gods is apt to be regarded as equivalent to treason against the established order of government.' [1]

With regard to Rome, Ramsay well describes the situation:

> 'Refusal to comply with the prescribed forms of respect to the Emperor was a refusal to be a member of the Roman unity and constituted disloyalty and treason. . . . Pliny found the procedure already established that a charge of Christianity should be tested by calling on the accused to perform the ceremonies of loyal service and worship to the Emperor.' [2]

Religious intolerance is equally disclaimed by modern Japan. Says an exponent of shrine Shinto,

> 'In the case of a civilized country there must exist freedom of faith. . . . Yet for a Japanese subject to refuse to honour the ancestors of the Emperor is disloyal. Indeed a Japanese out of his duty as subject must honour the ancestors of the Emperor. This cannot be a matter of choice. It is a duty. Therefore this cannot be regarded as a religion.' [3]

Except for that last sentence, the passage could be re-written with 'Roman' instead of 'Japanese' and its reference pushed back to the second century instead of the twentieth. There is the same antithesis, religious toleration as an accepted State policy on the one hand, and required submission to a State cultus on the other. Christians are faced with the same dilemma: they are not disloyal to the State, but if, from religious motives, they reject the State cultus, they will be regarded and treated as disloyal. The way out of the dilemma appears to be different. In the Roman Empire, Christians said, 'Then we must be misunderstood,' and endured the punishment of traitors. In the Japanese Empire, the Government is saying, 'Therefore this cannot be regarded as a religion.' That is the difference. Does such assurance on the part of the State make all the difference?

This compulsion, which we have noted at the end of the first and beginning of the second centuries did not continue as the invariable rule. In Japan attempts have been made to separate expressions of loyalty from that obeisance which had associations with pagan worship; Christians were to be allowed to bow to the flag, not to the shrine; or Christians at the shrine were to be allowed to pray to their own God on behalf of the Emperor, while disregarding his ancestors. Something entirely similar happened in the second century. Christians were sometimes allowed by a sympathetic official to take the oath *per salutem Imperatoris*, which they felt they could do with a clear conscience, instead of *per genium Caesaris*, which had associations with the heathen pantheon and was therefore refused.[4] A friendly authority might accept this oath as a sufficient test of loyalty. For that was still, indeed more than ever, the State's concern.

> 'Pagans were becoming increasingly anxious at the progress of a belief which seemed to destroy

[1] Sir Frederick Pollock, *Essays in Jurisprudence and Ethics*, 147 f.

[2] *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 275.

[3] Quoted by Holtom, *op. cit.* 69.

[4] Tertullian, *Apology*, 32.

the loyalty of the masses to tradition, and therewith their loyalty to the State itself.' [1]

But an official less friendly would be more exacting in his requirements, and—that meant martyrdom. With the coming of the great State-sponsored persecutions in the latter half of the third century, there would be less room for such clemency. Then the Empire's motive was to force a crisis—and where it could, to force apostasy.

In Japan, these attempts at compromise have already been disallowed. The act must be one of obeisance towards the *Kami* [2] of the shrine. The only room for compromise is in the matter of mental reservations: the State, so far from requiring any declaration of faith concerning the obeisance or its objects, discourages any discussion. The easiest way is to say, This is not religion, and submit. This way is recommended, nay, urged, by the State. Again I remind you, *that* is the difference—it almost seems the only difference—in the position of Christians in the two Empires.

Finally, let us apply the light of history to some current statements about the situation in Japan: Several reasons have been advanced why Christians ought to be able—as indeed most Japanese seem to have been able so far—to submit to the requirements of the State. By some it is said that 'the idol is nothing':

> 'There is no suggestion of idolatry because the Christian knows in his heart that an idol is nothing. Therefore if he asserts that his bow is one of secular deference to national authority, no harm is involved in obeisance at the shrines.' [3]

The best comment upon this kind of casuistry is Tertullian's:

> 'We cannot be held to do harm to (by refusing to worship) that which has no existence. . . . Some indeed think it a piece of insanity that, when it is in our power to offer sacrifice at once and go away unharmed, holding as ever our convictions, yet we prefer an obstinate persistence in our confession instead of safety. You advise us, forsooth, to take an unjust advantage of you. But we know . . . who is at the bottom of it all.' [4]

He means the devil.

Others argue that the founders of Shrine Shinto were themselves irreligious, therefore that which they founded cannot rightly be regarded as religion:

> 'Japanese Christians know that the men of the Meiji Restoration (of 1868) who devised the cult of national Shinto and incorporated these practices into the educational system . . . were self-confessed agnostics and nationalists. This seems to be true of many present-day officials who require the observance of these practices. This makes it easier to accept. . . .' [5]

Of course it is possible that the martyrs of the Western Church in its heroic period were mistaken. But to them too was open exactly the same escape:

> 'Hadrian himself was quite alive to the fact that the State religion was a sham, and, looked at as a religion, a failure; but he knew also that it was the keystone of the Imperial policy.' [6]

So wrote Professor Ramsay in the distant days of 1895. He little realized that during his lifetime at the other side of the world a march of events had begun which was to make these careful judgments of history applicable to a living situation.

Others again have said that refusal would be a falsification of the facts:

> 'Christian leaders . . . see the difficulties that would be involved in a refusal to observe these practices which are regarded as expressions of loyalty and patriotism. Japanese Christians are loyal. . . . To refuse . . . would be to brand themselves with a false label. It would also be an invitation to the authorities to put a ban on the entire Christian movement.' [7]

Strange things happen in Japan. A Christian youth seeking admission to a State university was asked at his interview, 'Who is the greater, your God, or the Emperor?' With such an attitude abroad, it is falsification of facts in the other direction which we as Christians should watch. To sum up:

> 'As the Tambaram findings say, the question at what point the challenge is to be resisted "must ultimately be left to the judgment and conscience of the church most concerned." That judgment will not be sound if it is ignorant of light and leading which have shone through dark periods before, nor will that conscience be fully Christian if it is forgetful of the great cloud of witnesses.' [8]

[1] Hugh Last in *Journal of Roman Studies*, xxvii. Pt. i., 1937.

[2] Difficult to translate into English; *numina* seems to fit best.

[3] *International Review of Missions*, April 1940, 168.

[4] *Apology*, 26.

[5] *International Review of Missions*, April 1940, 181.

[6] *The Church in the Roman Empire*, 324.

[7] *International Review of Missions*, April 1940, 181 f.

[8] A sentiment I expressed in *The Life of the Church*, Tambaram Madras Series, iv. 262.

Spiritual Problems and the War.

VIII. Suffering.

By the Reverend Canon J. K. Mozley, D.D., London.

On all the potentialities of human nature war throws so bright, if so terrible, a light, that its presence means the unveiling of much that in times of peace lies, as it were, within a shadow and only occasionally forces itself upon the attention of mankind. With war comes revelation; it shows what man really is by showing what in a final crisis he can be, do, and endure. It shows his limitless capacity for splendour and for shame. The revelation of man is at the same time the revelation of good and evil; that sheer opposition, which is the fundamental metaphysic of all ethics, is made manifest in war, yet far more profoundly within man than between men and between nations. Neither the patriot who identifies the clean cut between good and evil with his nation's cause against its enemy, nor the pacifist who condemns war as that in which no nation, under any circumstances whatever, ought to engage, is, if he stops, each at the one or the other particular point, seeing the ethical issues according to their true character. Doubtless a righteous cause has inherently some power to ennoble, and its reverse some power to debase; doubtless, if it is never right to make war, the consequences of an immoral activity will be as the fruit of an evil tree. But in neither case shall we be in a position to say anything as to what the war means ethically in the case of any single individual. What the war makes of him and what he makes of the war cannot be decided by reference to any pre-conceptions or general principles.

This doubtfulness, where the individual is concerned, is relevant to any consideration of the suffering which war so greatly intensifies and thereby raises, for many people, to the level of a moral and religious problem of the first order. They will say that it is not right that there should be so much suffering in the world, that innocent persons should have to endure such terrible things, and assert that such suffering invalidates belief in a God of love and justice and mercy. In this judgment a particular minus value is attached to suffering, derived, as it is supposed, from its essential character. But such a judgment breaks down on the undeniable fact that the reactions of individual sufferers to suffering differ most widely. For great numbers of people the experience of suffering, whether in war or apart from it, leads to no such conclusions. It would be absurd to suggest that such persons have not a right to be heard. The problem of suffering is a real intellectual problem, and the experiences of individuals do not lead to a solution; but a verdict that ignored them would be an example of an aloof intellectualism.

Suffering is indeed always the symbol of evil present in the world. If it were not so, it would be possible, without absurdity, to imagine the presence of suffering in heaven. The ideal of a 'place,' where there shall be no sorrow or sighing nor any more pain presupposes the fullness of moral and spiritual good. But the fact of suffering does not mean the increase of evil. The world is not a worse world because there is so much of suffering in it. The real evil is that which lies behind the suffering. Kant's doctrine of the good will as that which alone is absolutely good is true on its reverse side. Except in the belief that suffering has in itself a necessarily evil character comparable to that of the evil will, there is no final question which can be asked about suffering. All questions bearing upon it pass beyond it and become questions about man, the world, and God.

But these are questions to which the Christian believes he already knows the answer—in part, as through a glass darkly, yet true answers, derived not from illusions—idols—nor from wishful thinking, but from God's revelation of Himself in His Son. And it is with these answers as interpreters that he can face the suffering which he experiences and which he knows others experience.

In that revelation suffering was included as something without which our Lord, in the full reality of His human nature, could not have been what He was nor have done what He did. He might (one looks out upon fields of speculation where there is no sure footing for advance in knowledge) have united in Himself the divine and the human and passed through life as the manifest conqueror of all things and of all men that in any way were obstacles to the fulfilment of His Father's will; He might have been our Saviour in ways past our imagination and put us eternally in His debt. But He became

what He is to us, and made us the debtors which we are to Him by being the suffering Saviour. There was, indeed, manifest triumph in His life; to doubt the Gospels on that point is to be, not critical of particular narratives, but sceptical as to any possibility of reaching truth where those documents are concerned. But the climax of His life, that is of the divine revelation given in history, was the reverse of manifest triumph. The climax was a fulfilment, perfection, τελείωσις through sufferings, itself the fullest illumination of the paradox, unintelligible to thought and judgment that moved and moves wholly on the human plane, that Jesus, though He was the Son, learnt obedience by the things He suffered. No interpretation, no commentary upon the life of Christ, comes near to doing justice to the New Testament text if it breaks that unity of sonship, suffering, and obedience in which the writer to the Hebrews saw the foundation in personal reality, experience, and development of the high priesthood and unique sacrifice of Jesus, the Son of God.

The paradox of the learning through experiences that involved the presence of suffering and were at their highest point experiences of suffering, so that, at the end, the story of Jesus is the story of the Passion of Jesus, is seen in its most acute and challenging character when the repeated apostolic testimony to Jesus as the Sinless One is borne in mind. He who was separate from sinners, this Man who had done nothing amiss, suffered *as though* in Him the equation of sin and suffering were being most clearly and incontrovertibly demonstrated. And all the time a quite different equation was being, not shown, but created. It is not a case of *Quod erat demonstrandum*, but of *Quod erat faciendum*, with the reservation that here was something, which, if it were to be done, only God could do. Only He, the Son, who is true God in the verity of human nature, could in His sufferings bear, and by His sufferings take away, the sin of the world.

Because this is the truth of the Gospel, Christ is the Christian's final security, an indomitable security, in all suffering. The real question about suffering is not as to its meaning when viewed as a philosophical problem. Does suffering show, not by argument but by the impact of the actual fact, that there is a limit to the believer's faith in Jesus Christ, since here is a region where He is not Lord and Saviour? That is the real question, and the Gospel as preached and received, that is, on the human side, is at stake in the answer. Faith in Jesus Christ which has limits is not what the New Testament and the Christian Church would ever recognize as Christian faith. It is not faith in Christ or in the Father whom He revealed.

That is a question which, ultimately, each person must answer for himself, however he comes by the answer. What is certain is that from St. Stephen onwards countless Christians have made it plain by deed and word that faith has no limits. For them suffering has meant not the way down into despair but the way up to Christ at the right hand of God, where Stephen saw Him. And many who have been through the fire of suffering, whether in their own persons, or in the persons of those they love, or in the afflictions of their country, may have learnt that way more surely than some who, with all their sympathy, have been only observers.

War makes suffering weigh more heavily as an experienced fact, and this increased weight will in many cases convert consciousness of a fact into consciousness of a problem. But to the Christian the supreme lesson which war should bring is not that now he needs to take all his bearings afresh, but that now he needs to keep still more steadfastly upon his course; he has no need of new bearings, only a fuller faith in Christ, his Compass and his Star.

Literature.

THE CHRISTIAN'S KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

We have no hesitation in pronouncing *The Christian's Knowledge of God*, by the Professor of History and Philosophy of Religion in Knox College, Toronto, the Rev. W. W. Bryden, M.A., D.D. (Thorn Press, Toronto; $2.50 net), to be as noble and as illuminating a study of the present-day theological situation as has yet appeared. 'The book came into being,' the author tells us, 'through a feeling that something of good might result from a frank discussion of those historic and other causes which have led to the present theological perplexity' in the churches and particularly in modernist Protestant circles. Professor Bryden is deeply convinced that the elements in Christianity on which modern Liberal theology has laid stress are quite inadequate to sustain the

claim of unique authority with which Christianity first appeared and which it has maintained throughout its history.

The first task is to make clear what are the historical and philosophical presuppositions which have gone to the shaping of Liberal theology in its presentation of Christianity. Its critical method has been, in a word, to treat the Christian revelation as part of the *continuum* of history, to ally it to idealistic ethics, and to place it against the flat surface of the human process, thus attempting an evaluation of 'the Jesus of history.' Hence, as Dr. Bryden pertinently says, historical criticism, in reducing Jesus Christ to proportions which accord with the higher possibilities of human life, and in understanding the Christian revelation to be but a supreme exemplification of human, moral, and religious values, has operated with a conception of God and of God's relation to mankind which, to say the least, is 'new in the history of the Church.'

In reality the manifestation of God in Jesus is not an affirmation but a total denial of every human, ethical, and religious value. And only so does it become the instrument of a world's regeneration. Over against this bias to come to terms with the religious and philosophical ideas of human society, we do well to remind ourselves of the essentially *eschatological* character of the Christian revelation. Christ came not to destroy the Law or the prophets, but to fulfil them. Yes! but with regard to every self-claim for man's wisdom and righteousness He came to destroy and to destroy utterly. 'He came to empty man completely of the significance that man by nature attaches to himself.' 'This revelation, because of its eternal character, serves to negate temporalities, points to their *end*, and serves to disillusion man utterly.' This is what we mean by saying that the Biblical revelation belongs strictly to the category of the eschatological. Moreover, it is because Christianity brings us first to a nothingness of self-claim that it opens to us the possibility of a true wisdom and of a real life.

Perhaps the most important part of the book is to be found in chs. iv. and v. in which the author deals with 'New Testament Revelation' and 'The Exclusive Nature of Biblical Revelation.' Here it is contended that the revelation of God in Jesus is not grounded in the nature of His personal attributes or history, externally considered, or in His ethical and religious pronouncements, but in the peculiar religious experience by which His person, His teaching, His death become to us the instrument of the judgment and of the salvation of God. What St. Paul says in 2 Co 5^{16} is in this respect final. 'Man's saving knowledge of God according to the New Testament is something not at man's command at all, but is that which simply *comes* to him, "apprehends" him.' Now revelation so understood can never be rationalized, for that would signify the bringing of God entirely within the orbit of our human understanding, and this upon any radical conception of God's nature in relation to us is impossible.

While it is not possible to pursue the details of Professor Bryden's argument to all their conclusions reference may be made to the finely toned defence of the ancient Catholic creeds in ch. vi. and to the discussion of the relation of Christianity to ethics, and of the Church to the State and to nationalism in ch. vii. 'In the Protestantism of modern times,' Dr. Bryden writes, 'the substitution of an idealistic ethic for the Biblical Righteousness of God has done no more than make men judges or assessors of themselves. Moral sanctions have become relative.'

There is much illuminating comment in the book on the comparative claims of Protestant and Roman theology to embody original Christianity for the modern mind, and much fruitful reflection on the relation of revelation to history. It may be doubted at times whether Professor Bryden has done adequate justice to all aspects of the systems which he indicts, as, for example, to the motives inspiring historical criticism in its approach to the Gospels and to primitive Christianity. Again, it may be queried whether Professor Bryden has correctly grasped the actual (very negative) relation in which modern Form Criticism stands to the Church's confession and theology. To say that Form Criticism has established the confessional character of the evangelical tradition does not mean that that tradition has for it the same value as it has for Professor Bryden. Such matters are, however, of minor importance when regard is had to the purpose of the book as a whole, and those who know the fine qualities of mind and spirit characterizing Dr. Bryden's work will rejoice that he has given to wider circles a quite first-rate contribution to the elucidation of a central theological issue of the day.

W. MANSON.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION—A NEW APPROACH.

A Policy in Religious Education, by E. F. Braley, M.A., LL.D. (University of London Press; 5s. net).

This is an important book. The author is an Honorary Canon of Durham and Principal of the College of the Venerable Bede. He is therefore a loyal Anglican churchman and an expert in the subject on which he writes here. It would be difficult to exaggerate the merits of his book which is notable particularly for its breadth of mind and the competence of its author.

There is no doubt that the cause of religious education has suffered tragically from the divisions of the churches and their stiff-necked obstinacy and narrowness. Dr. Braley quotes some sombre words written by the Archbishop of York which faithfully describe the situation to which we have been brought: 'By our denominational selfishness and antagonisms and stupidities we have jeopardized the whole cause of religion in education. I doubt if the British public realizes the extent to which young England is growing up virtually pagan. If the churches cannot get together and find agreement on some common policy to preserve Christian teaching in our schools—if they will not renounce some privileges and sink some prejudices for the sake of this object . . . we can have little hope that educational authorities . . . will be ready to make one more attempt to deal effectively with this thorny subject. . . . England is not yet an un-Christian nation. But it is fast becoming what somebody has called it, "a religious people without a religion," and the seed of this deficiency is sown in our educational system. The failure is that of the educational authorities, but the guilt lies on the churches.'

That is a true picture of the past. But there is a rising hope that Christian men are learning the lesson of failure and are opening their eyes to the urgent demand for unity. Indeed it is not too much to say that there is to-day an opportunity for religious and educational adventure which, faithfully used, may give to Christian teaching a new place and power in our national life. It is to further such a blessed project that Dr. Braley has written his book. With the churches united, the State willing, the teachers sound, and the education authorities sympathetic—can this agreement not issue in a policy?, he asks, and sets his hand to sketch one.

He has to deal with some hard problems, but he faces them boldly. There is the problem of the Church schools, which are more of a liability than an asset. Dr. Braley would hand them over to the State with the frank statement that the Church desires a sound education for all the children of the country and is ready to sacrifice her denominational position in order to secure this. But on two conditions, one, that religion should be an integral part of every educational institution, and two, that it shall be taught by people able and willing to do so.

This is an example of the fine spirit in which the writer approaches every problem. He points to the agreed syllabuses as a proof of the real unity underlying our differences and the possibility of teaching vital Christian truth without any denominational bias. He describes faithfully the condition of the present Training Colleges. He deals with the alienation often existing between teachers and clergy. But through all he writes there is the one constant appeal for a new spirit in our attitude to the question of religion in the school. Even now many do not realize that the future of our nation is involved, that a pagan England would not be much of an improvement on a pagan Germany, and that we have an eleventh-hour chance of repentance and renewal. If we lose that the prospect is a bleak one. It is to be hoped that Dr. Braley's book will have a wide circulation, and that it will help to bring together men of good will to work for a Christian Britain.

F. J. Rae.

ST. LEO THE GREAT.

It would appear that until now there has been no adequate monograph in English on that distinguished and influential occupant of the Roman See, Leo I., commonly called 'the Great.' Dr. Bright has edited a selection of Leo's 'Sermons on the Incarnation,' and Dr. Gore has given us a sketch of Leo's life. Apart from this, the English reader has had to follow Leo's life and thought in the references contained in more general works. But recently a very satisfying monograph has been published—*The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (S.P.C.K.; 21s. net), by the Rev. Trevor Jalland, M.A., B.D. It has been published for the Church Historical Society, and, as we should anticipate, is a learned and scholarly contribution to its subject. It is amply documented, and is equipped with useful Indexes and a valuable Bibliography.

As the title indicates, the author presents to us the figure of Leo against the background of contemporary history; and he has succeeded in his twofold aim, of drawing a more accurate picture of Leo's life and work than has hitherto been available, and of bringing into clearer relief 'the commanding features of a noble character.'

The greater part of the volume is occupied with the story of Leo's relations to the churches of the West and of the East. His actions, motives, and opinions are subjected to a careful, indeed minute, scrutiny. The author has even taken the trouble to analyse and tabulate Leo's ethical and theological doctrine.

A point clearly brought out is Leo's exalted conception of his office as Bishop of Rome, a conception which governed his relations with other churches outside the limits of the Roman province. And undoubtedly he won great prestige for the Roman See, but less in the sphere of jurisdiction than in that of doctrine. The Definition of Chalcedon bears witness to this being largely dependent on the Leonine Christology as contained in the famous 'Tome' which (as Mr. Jalland reminds us not once, nor twice!) was addressed as a letter to Flavian of Constantinople. Leo made of this letter a final standard of orthodoxy, but Mr. Jalland does well to remark that the authority which belongs to the 'Tome' belongs to it in virtue of the Council of Chalcedon's approbation and not in virtue simply of its Roman or papal origin. W. Fulton.

DIPLOMACY AND GOD.

A well-informed book dealing with the international situation—past, present, and future—from the Christian standpoint is entitled *Diplomacy and God*. It is by Mr. George Glasgow, who is already the author of many books on politics and finance (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). The author has for the past twenty-one years been the diplomatic correspondent of the 'Observer,' and for the past nineteen years has written the monthly chronicle and commentary on Foreign Affairs in the 'Contemporary Review.' Add to this that he is an earnest Christian and you have an adequate competence to deal with the subject named in the title of his book. The book itself is divided between history and criticism. The author first of all sketches the characteristic features of diplomacy. He then shows, by a review of the course of international relations in recent times, how these have led to failure. And finally he has some positive suggestions to make. Diplomacy has failed because it has left God out. It has left God out because religious people themselves commonly leave Him out of ordinary life. In other words, religion is kept in a place by itself. And what ordinary people do in common life, statesmen do in the transactions of nations. Mr. Glasgow makes a special appeal to the churches to come together and bear a united witness to the reality of God in the world. Nobody will listen to them when they are at odds among themselves.

This appeal for an acknowledgment of God in practical affairs is the heart of Mr. Glasgow's book. It is a moving appeal, nobly uttered. And of course it should never have been necessary. But, being necessary, it is made here with all the fervour of a convinced believer to whom God is a reality, and with the authority of an experienced observer of life on the great scale. The book, however, has a constructive, practical contribution to make. Mr. Glasgow's remedy for the world's ills is (1) total and universal disarmament, (2) a total league of nations (the failure of the last one was due to its representing only a few nations); and (3) an accepted curtailment of its sovereignty by each nation in this league. The last of these suggestions points to some form of federalism. It will be seen that this book has several sides—diplomacy, God, and practical politics. But they are all made one by the faith of the writer that God can manage the world—if we will let Him. F. J. Rae.

German versus Hun, by Carl Brinitzer and Berthe Grossbard (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), though commended in a brief Foreword by the Rt. Hon. Duff Cooper, is a book in which it is difficult to find either pleasure or profit. It is described as 'a book which consists of extracts from the writings of prominent Germans of all periods and creeds—including Nazis—and reveals the unchanging vein of violence and hysteria that runs perpetually through the national character.' These extracts, which we roughly estimate at about a thousand in number, are drawn from all manner of German writers of the last three centuries. The number of writers quoted is over three hundred, and they vary from Luther to Hitler, from Kant to Nietzsche, from grim old Hindenburg to Princess Daisy of Pless. Most of the extracts are very brief, and being torn from their context have frequently little significance. Not to mention the strictures which the old Testament prophets passed on the people of Israel, it would be interesting, if hardly worth the labour, to compile a similar anthology of extracts from English writers of the last three centuries about the English people. Many bitter words would be brought to light, but who would accept them as a just analysis of our national character? So with the present volume. It may

provide an armoury of controversial quotations but it cannot be said to be really informative or enlightening.

A pleasant and edifying book of discourses is published by the Epworth Press with the title *New Horizons*, by the Rev. Frederick C. Gill, M.A. (3d. 6d. net). It is, in a good sense, easy to read. It is also inspiring. The titles of the chapters are attractive—The Secular Adventures of the Soul, Christ or Apollo?, The Logic of Righteousness. There are suggestions here that might fairly be used as the seeds of helpful expositions. But its chief value will be found for private and devotional reading. There is charm in the style and the meditations are lightened by many appropriate literary allusions.

In his review of *The Religious Opinions of Milton, Locke, and Newton* (Manchester University Press; 7s. 6d. net), the Rev. H. M'Lachlan, M.A., D.D., Principal of the Unitarian College, Manchester, has written a most interesting and informing book on Unitarianism generally and its historical development. He can justly claim that the three men who are the subject of his inquiry are among the greatest of Englishmen, and their opinions on religious questions deserve attentive respect. These have to be understood, of course, in the background of their times, and not even Dr. McLachlan can tell what they would have thought or believed to-day. But he certainly succeeds in bringing into relief the broad, general principles for which the best type of Unitarian has stood, freedom of inquiry, toleration, the application of reason to religious problems, and the rejection of authority and credal tests. One very interesting fact to which he draws attention is that in the higher Unitarianism there has often been a marked strain of mysticism or at least a direct and overwhelming experience of the presence of God. And that is only one feature of a book which is illuminating and instructive throughout. It is a valuable contribution to the history of religious thought in this country.

The wide prevalence to-day of silly superstitions may fairly be taken as an indication of the decay of intelligent Christian faith. For this reason it perhaps deserves more serious consideration than the contempt of enlightened minds is apt to give it. Professor Clement F. Rogers, M.A., has thought it worth while to issue a little book on the subject, *Astrology in the Light of Science and Religion* (S.C.M.; 1s. 3d. net). It is quite elementary and within the grasp of the meanest intelligence. In it the writer shows by the simple facts of astronomy how absurd the claims of astrology are, and he recommends further study of science and religion as the best cure for such childish superstitions.

The Student Christian Movement Press has published an extremely useful and comprehensive guide to places, people and events, churches, and societies in Christendom, under the title *A Christian Year Book 1941* (2s. 6d. net). It includes, first, a survey of the beliefs, organization and origins of the several communions in the Christian Church, each done by a specialist writer, a description of every continent and region from the Christian viewpoint, a section on Religious Education, one on Christian Social Service, another on Women and the Churches, still another on the outstanding books of 1940, and, finally, a Directory of Churches and Societies. The general editors are the Rev. Hugh Martin and the Rev. E. A. Payne, and the editorial committee contains several well-known names. In the first section alone there are no fewer than eleven writers, and they have done their work well. The book is full of interest and value, and it would not be easy to find serious flaws in it. It may be gently suggested, however, to the writer of the section on Christian Education that there is such a place as Scotland, with four training colleges for teachers and a definite and universal system of religious instruction.

The Use of Hyperbole in Scripture.

By Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., D.Litt., Oxford.

For the right understanding of the Bible more is necessary than even the most exact rendering of its contents into English. For the Biblical languages, like all languages, have not only their own vocabularies, but their peculiar *thought-idioms* also. The ways in which these latter differ from the British thought-idioms of to-day are perhaps not such as to render the literal translation of a simple Biblical narrative misleading to a British reader. But there were certain peculiarities about the thought-processes of the Oriental mind two millennia ago, in consequence of which the means it would occasionally employ to express itself were so different from what a Western mind would employ, that a literal rendering of the words would not convey to the modern reader what was meant. Since grave issues sometimes hang on the interpretation of such passages, danger of error is involved in any failure to allow for the special thought-idiom the author may have been using.

It is the function of commentaries to reveal the author's meaning whenever an exact translation of his words obscures it; and to a large extent commentaries do this. But there are certain usages which escape true interpretation because of the very simplicity of their appearance. These all exemplify in some form the non-modern use of hyperbole or over-statement as a means of obtaining emphasis. In each ensuing group of examples I will commence with those that are undeniable, so that, when the reader is invited to consider some examples that are less obvious, he may not suspect that he is being treated to mere rationalistic speculation or pretentious cleverness.

My first case is the use of an unreal negative to emphasize an important affirmative, *i.e.* the use of 'not', when what is really meant is 'not only'. Ask yourself whether the following underlined negatives are to be regarded as strictly true:

'Whoever receives me *receives not me*, but Him who sent me' (Mk 9^{37}).

'. . . rendering service, as unto the Lord, and *not unto men*' (Eph 6^{7}).

'My teaching *is not mine*, but (belongs) to Him who sent me' (Jn 7^{16}).

'He who believes on me *believes not on me*, but on Him who sent me' (Jn 12^{44}).

'The word which ye hear *is not mine*, but (belongs) to the Father who sent me' (Jn 14^{24}).

Before proceeding to controversial passages, let me reinforce this evidence by adding a few other fairly clear instances.

The righteous Davidic ruler '*will not judge by that which his eyes see; nor by that which his ears hear will he decide*: but he will judge the needy with righteousness, and decide with equity for the poor of the earth' (Is $11^{3f.}$; cf. also 2 Es 1^{27}).

'The Kingdom of God is *not (manifested) in word*, but in power' (1 Co 4^{20}).

'. . . *let us not love in word, nor with the tongue*, but in deed and reality' (1 Jn 3^{18}).

'Work *not for the food which perishes*, but for the food which abides unto eternal life . . .' (Jn 6^{27}).

'. . . *I spake not from myself*, but the Father that sent me gave me a commandment what I should say . . .' (Jn 12^{49}).

These instances suffice to prove that Biblical writers often made negative statements which were not meant to be taken at their face-value, but were simply intended to set in greater relief the accompanying affirmative assertions. It therefore becomes pertinent to ask whether the same thing has not happened in some less obvious cases.

The most probable of these is the saying, '*I dia not come to invite righteous (men)*, but sinners' (Mk 2^{17}; cf. Lk 5^{32}, Mt 9^{13b}). When Paul wrote, 'My speech and my preaching *did not (consist) in persuasive words of wisdom*, but in the demonstration given by the Spirit and its power, that your faith might rest *not on the wisdom of men* but on the power of God' (1 Co 2^{4}), he did not mean that the Christian preachers were foolish or that their words were unpersuasive and unwise, but simply that behind them there was the power of God's Spirit.

Possibly the same semi-rhetorical usage may give us the key to that much-discussed passage—Lk $17^{20f.}$: 'The Kingdom of God does not come (in a way discernible) with watching; nor will men say, "Behold, here it is!" or "There it is!" for behold, the Kingdom of God is (already) in your midst'. There are no sufficient grounds for denying

the genuineness of this logion: but, except on some such lines as those here suggested, it is difficult to harmonize it with the numerous other indications in the Gospels that Jesus expected a future cataclysmic coming of the Kingdom. I imagine He desired to assert that in Himself, His disciples, and His work, God's Kingdom was already present, and to discourage excited concentration on some supposedly imminent climax. He therefore uses the figure of speech we have been studying, without intending to deny categorically that a future climax would occur.

The next case is the custom of using, in a causal sentence, a categorical instead of a concessive clause, when the latter is what is really meant.

Thus in Is 12^1 we read, 'And on that day shalt thou say, "*I will thank thee, Yahweh, because thou wast angry with me*, and thine anger has turned away. . . ."' Yet Israel would be glad, not because Yahweh had been angry, but because, *although* He had been angry, He had now turned from anger to comforting. The A.V. and the R.V. both give the right sense by translating inexactly, '*though* thou wast angry with me'.

Again, Paul writes, 'But *thanks be to God that ye were slaves of sin*; but ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching. . . .' (Ro 6^{17}). But obviously he could not have been thankful that his readers had once been enslaved to sin. What made him thankful was that, *though* that was so, they were enslaved no longer. The A.V. translates literally and misleadingly, 'But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin: but ye have obeyed from the heart', etc. The R.V. gives the true sense by paraphrasing.

This idiom is further exemplified in Jesus' words to His host: 'Whenever thou givest . . . a dinner, do not invite . . . thy relatives or rich neighbours, lest perchance they in their turn invite thee back, and a repayment be made to thee. But whenever thou givest a party, invite poor (men) . . . And thou shalt be happy, *because they are not able to repay thee*, for repayment shall be made to thee at the resurrection of the righteous' (Lk 14^{12-14}). It can hardly be maintained that the inability of the poor to repay is of itself meant as the reason why the generous host is to consider himself lucky:[1] the ground of his felicity surely is that, *although* his guests cannot repay him on earth, he will get his reward hereafter. Incidentally, the apparent prohibition of entertaining rich acquaintances might be added to the list under our former heading as an unreal negative, whereof the true meaning was that hospitality was not to be *confined* to such persons.

There is another important Gospel-passage which apparently illustrates the same figure of speech. 'I thank thee, Father, . . . that thou didst hide these things from wise and intelligent (men), and didst reveal them to babes. Yea, Father (I thank thee), that so it seemed good before thee' (Lk 10^{21} = Mt $11^{25f.}$). For our immediate purpose we may ignore the question as to what precisely is meant by 'these things', as well as the deterministic tone of the passage. For the moment we may be content to recognize the simple fact that some saw, and others did not see, the truth. Whatever be the real relation of the Divine omnipotence to this fact, what Jesus was thankful for was not that some did not see, but that, *although* some did not see, others did.[2]

As a third group I adduce a few passages in which hyperbole takes the form of an imaginative over-statement, rather than of a particular grammatical construction, as in the cases so far quoted. Usually the exaggeration is so obvious that the use of it could not give rise to perplexity; nonetheless, the readiness to use it is worth noting, as it will prevent us misconstruing less simple and perhaps more important passages.

In 1 K 22^{31}, the Syrian King commands the captains of his chariots before battle: 'Fight with neither small nor great, save only with the King of Israel'. He could hardly have intended his words to be taken literally.

Among the least contentious instances in the Gospels are the declaration, 'the very hairs of your head are all numbered' (Mt 10^{30} = Lk 12^7; cf. Lk 21^{18}, 1 S 14^{45}), and the queer statement in Jn 21^{25}. Then we have the warning, 'It is easier for a camel to go through the needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God' (Mk 10^{25} = Lk 18^{25} = Mt 19^{24}). Modern commentators no longer try to reduce the hyperbole by making a cable of the camel or a narrow gate of the needle's eye. If, as Wellhausen plausibly argued, the original reading in Mark referred to entrants generally and not specifically to rich men, the exaggeration is still more glaring, for Jesus elsewhere freely depicts persons entering the Kingdom. But even without that plea the hyperbole is patent enough, for Jesus proceeds to say that what was impossible for men was possible for God; yet

[1] *Pace* Plummer's note *ad loc.*

[2] So McNeile, in his note *ad loc.*: 'Jesus was thankful, not that the σοφοί were ignorant but, that the νήπιοι knew'.

(with reverence be it said) not even God can make a camel pass through a needle's eye. Quite clearly the saying is an Eastern teacher's way of emphasizing the difficulty of the task of entering the Kingdom.

With this passage one naturally groups the little set of sayings in which the removal of a tree or mountain into the sea is declared to be possible as a result of faith (Mk $11^{22f.}$, Lk 17^{6}, Mt 17^{20} 21^{21}; cf. 1 Co 13^{2}). There can be little doubt, in face of the other evidence for the use of hyperbole, that Jesus was not thinking of spectacular marvels. He was speaking at once figuratively and hyperbolically—in the manner of the Eastern prophet; and we do not truly grasp His meaning for ourselves until we have reduced His words to the soberer logical pattern which the modern Christian is constrained to use. Tennyson was giving a good paraphrase of the saying when he wrote,

> More things are wrought by prayer
> Than this world dreams of.

The injunction to pluck out the eye and amputate the hand or foot which causes stumbling (Mk $9^{43.\ 45.\ 47}$=Mt $5^{29f.}$ $18^{8f.}$) is another instance of figurative hyperbole. It probably refers to the severe self-denial which the law of sex-purity may involve. Its position in Mark is determined by the fact that, like Mk 9^{42}, it deals with hindrances: its position in Mt 18 is determined by the Marcan parallel. We cannot build on its connexion in Mt 5, though this happens to fit in with the probable meaning. Origen took literally the words of Jesus reported in Mt 19^{12} (εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς . . .): and a modern German scholar has argued that, in view of the intensity characterizing Jesus' spirit, Origen may not after all have been far wrong. But the well-attested Eastern habit of hyperbole relieves us of the necessity for any such grim and otherwise most improbable inference. I would, however, add that such an interpretation of the amputation-passage as I have urged does not imply that Jesus did not share the customary Jewish belief in the participation of the physical body in the life beyond.

There are a few non-figurative hyperbolic passages in the Gospels. As Dr. McNeile has pointed out,[1] it was Jesus' custom, in enunciating ethical injunctions, simply to omit any needful qualifications. The same principle holds good in His other enunciations. Thus: 'All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and they shall be yours' (Mk 11^{24}= Mt 21^{22}). It is surely impossible to contend that this promise stands in need of no qualification; yet here it is, given without qualification.

Many Bible readers must have been puzzled by the declaration in Lk 15^{7} (cf. Mt 18^{13}), 'there will be (more) joy in heaven over one repentant sinner than over ninety-nine righteous (men) who have no need of repentance'. All that is meant here is virtually what is somewhat differently stated in the parallel passage three verses later (Lk 15^{10}): 'Thus, I tell you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one repentant sinner'.

Special interest within this field belongs to sayings suggesting endless duration. In this connexion the unpardonable sin at once occurs to the mind: and much anguish on the part of devout believers might have been spared if due attention had from the first been paid to Jewish idiom.

It may be worth while to remember that in our own tongue words like 'always', 'never', 'constantly', 'permanently', 'perpetually', are commonly used to express the idea, not of absolute unendingness, but simply of duration for a considerable length of time. It is the same in Hebrew and Greek: hence ambiguity often arises. The commonest Hebrew word used to express eternity is עוֹלָם (literally, 'age'). It is used both to describe the unending life of God Himself (*e.g.* Gn 21^{33}, Ex 3^{15}, Dt 32^{40}, Is 40^{28}, Dn 12^{7}), and also to designate periods of prolonged but limited duration. Thus, in 1 S 1^{22} 27^{12}, Ex 21^{6}, Dt 15^{17}, and Jon 40^{28} (Eng. 41^{5}), it means the duration of a single human or animal life. Compare also its meaning in Is 32^{14} in the light of ^{15}. So elastic a word might clearly be used to express many different shades of meaning, both vague and precise, in connexion with duration. The Greek equivalent of עוֹלָם is *αἰών*, which, together with its adjective *αἰώνιος*, expresses both long finite duration,[2] unending duration, and also eschatological quality ('characteristic of the Coming Age') without any direct reference to duration. How little we can depend on the strict meaning of such terms is clear from the use Jewish writers made of another word which normally suggests everlastingness—נֶצַח or לָנֶצַח. Consider such an expression as, '*How long*, Yahweh, wilt thou forget me *for ever* (נֶצַח)?' (Ps 13^{2} [Eng.[1]], similarly Ps 79^{5} 89^{47} [Eng. ^{46}]).

[1] *St. Matthew*, 66*b*, 67*b*, 70*b*, 90*a*.

[2] J. H. Leckie, in *The World to Come and Final Destiny*, 350, gives a collection of passages from Enoch and Baruch in which 'for ever' is used of *limited* time.

This fluidity in the meaning of terms, coupled with the disposition to employ exaggeration as a normal means of emphasis, led to a tendency to express abhorrence of any particularly serious form of wrongdoing by declaring that it would never be forgiven (*e.g.* Nu $15^{30f.}$, 1 S 3^{14}, Is 22^{14}). Such expressions had a natural root in the early notion that certain offences must incur the death-penalty. Analogous phrases would survive in use long after the civic context or implication had been forgotten. The habit of pronouncing an offence unpardonable thus grew up as a normal way of pronouncing it to be utterly heinous. That, surely, is the key to Jesus' words about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (Mk 3^{28-30}, Lk 12^{10}, Mt $12^{31f.}$). Dr. McNeile rightly says in his note on Mt $12^{31f.}$, 'If the Lord spoke as a Jew to Jews, and used a type of expression current in His day, and derived from the O.T., He meant, and would be understood to mean, no more than that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, by whose power He worked, was a terrible sin,—more terrible than blasphemy against man.'

The writings of the Rabbis, which reflect in large measure the linguistic customs of serious Jews in Jesus' day, contain many striking exaggerations, which—like those in Scripture—could not have been meant to be taken literally, and were used only because it was well known that they would not be so taken. Thus:

> 'He that has never seen the joy of the Beth ha-Sha'ubah' (at the Feast of Tabernacles) 'has never in his life seen joy' (*Sukkah*, 5^1: Danby, *Mishnah*, 179).
>
> 'Greater stringency applies to [the observance of] the words of the Scribes than to [the observance of] the words of the [written] Law' (*Sanhedrin*, 11^3: Danby, 400).

The canonicity of the Song of Songs was long in dispute among the Rabbis. When Rabbi Akiba wished to pronounce emphatically for its inclusion in the Canon, he did so in these terms: 'No man in Israel ever disputed about the Song of Songs [that he should say] that it does not render the hands unclean' (*i.e.* is not canonical), 'for all the ages are not worth the day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel; for all the Writings are holy, but the Song of Songs is the Holy of Holies' (*Yadaim*, 3^5: Danby, 782).[1]

In bringing this brief study to an end, I would offer the following comments:

(1) The existence in Scripture of a custom of obtaining emphasis by means of over-statement, such as would be disallowed as gravely misleading in modern Western speech, is proved up to the hilt, and therewith the need of making due allowance for it in exegesis.

(2) A more complete study of the evidence would probably show the usage to be far more prevalent than my collection of quotations suggests.

(3) The effort to make due allowance for this particular difference in thought-idiom between Bible-times and our own is neither (*a*) a prosaic and logic-chopping maltreatment of the free poetical effusions of Scripture—for the poetical and emotional tone of certain parts of Scripture does not remove the need for precise exegesis, nor is it (*b*) a rationalistic 'watering-down' of the great utterances of Scripture, reducing its spiritual glories to the level of 'liberal' commonplaces—for the honest translation of a Scriptural thought into modern forms of expression is a different thing from reducing it to a commonplace or robbing it of either its beauty or its vital importance.

[1] Cf. *A Rabbinic Anthology*, compiled by C. G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, pp. xlv f., lxxxiv f., ci, 115 (304), 128 (341), 138, 252 (655), 399 (1093), 686 f. (Note 84). Four of these passages refer to unforgivable sins.

The Bi-Centenary of Handel's 'Messiah.'

By the Reverend Francis B. Westbrook, B.A., Mus.D., London.

'I hope to satisfy the reader . . . that those ages which were impregnated with Catholic truth produced nobler architecture and nobler art than the ages which have been infected with anti-Catholic heresies.' So writes Mr. Arnold Lunn on p. 56 of his fascinating book *Now I See*.

It is not clear whether Mr. Lunn excludes the Fine Arts generally when he mentions art. Concerning painting and sculpturing I am in no position to judge. If, however, music is to be included in Mr. Lunn's list, most, if not all music lovers, will find his statement singularly unconvincing. Music, as we know it to-day, was practically non-existent in the Middle Ages. The finest composer of ancient Catholic music on the Continent—Palestrina—lived in the Reformation era: and it may be noted that he wrote his famous Marcelli Mass to correct abuses which had crept into the writing of church music, particularly in the setting of the words.

North Germany in the eighteenth century was indeed a veritable hotbed of anti-Catholic heresies. Yet it produced John Sebastian Bach, the staunch Protestant of whom Schumann wrote: 'Music owes to him almost as great a debt as a religion owes to its founder.' In his 'St. Matthew Passion' he makes extensive use of Lutheran chorales, the chief glory of early Protestant music: and this monumental composition is described by our own illustrious Elgar as 'the noblest sacred work in existence.'

Two hundred years ago this August another product of North German Protestantism and a contemporary of Bach—George Frederick Handel—wrote the most celebrated oratorio the world has ever heard. This was the *Messiah* (not 'The Messiah,' as Dr. Percy Scholes has reminded us). England became the home of this great master—he was naturalized in 1726—and of his marvellous oratorio. To call it marvellous is not mere platitudinizing. Every time the work is re-examined one can readily understand the utterance of Beethoven. 'Handel is the greatest, the ablest composer that ever lived. I can still learn from him.' Haydn, the Austrian genius, on hearing the Hallelujah chorus in Westminster Abbey, exclaimed with tears in his eyes—'he (Handel) is the master of us all!'

The *Messiah* derives its libretto from the English Bible. Its subject from first to last is Christ. The libretto was compiled by Charles Jennens, a Leicestershire squire who often entertained Handel at his country seat at Gopsall. According to Newman Flower, however, the actual spade work was done by a poor parson secretary named Pooley. The words, selected in the main from the prophetic writings of Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Psalms in the Old Testament, and from the Gospel of St. Luke, St. Paul's Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse in the New, adhere to the traditional conception of our Lord's Person and redemptive purpose in His incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, and reign in glory.

The prophecies bespeaking His loneliness and humiliation are given distinct prominence (cf. the numbers 'He was despised and rejected,' 'He trusted in God that He would deliver Him,' 'Thy rebuke hath broken His heart,' 'Behold and see if there be any sorrow,' and 'He was cut off out of the land of the living.') But His divinity and supernatural splendour is also stressed, as is seen in the items 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates'; 'Let all the angels of God worship Him'; 'Thou art gone up on high'; 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain' and, of course, 'Hallelujah.'

No earthly scenes of our Lord's life are referred to. Jennens followed the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds in leaping at one bound from the Incarnation to the Crucifixion, if we exclude the delightful parenthesis 'He shall feed His flock.' It is worth while bearing in mind that Elgar's oratorio *The Apostles* gives considerable prominence to our Lord's life on earth. He starts with the annunciation of the mission of Jesus ('The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me') and follows a more or less historical sequence to the Ascension. One observes the modern interest in the Jesus of history in 1903 as contrasted with the outlook of 1741.

Handel wrote the whole of the music, including the scoring, in the almost incredibly short space of twenty-four days. He began his work on the 22nd August 1741 and concluded it on 14th September. He carefully dated each part as he finished it. There is scarcely any doubt, however, that he had been ruminating over the music scheme for some little time. Composers, like authors, often have ideas of their future works clearly delineated

in their heads before ever they put pen to paper, and in the case of such a prolific genius as Handel, works had no sooner been conceived than the only further effort required was the writing of them down. A facility that might well be envied!

The music of the *Messiah* must be familiar to most readers. Whatever else they may not know, here is something with which they must have been acquainted from their youth up. Its ability to stand the 'wreckful siege of battering time' is a proof of its inherent vitality. Certain characteristics of the eighteenth century treatment of words, however, will always strike the modern ear as a curious feature.

Chief among these is the singing of a whole string of notes to one syllable. Sometimes this is not without effectiveness, such as the long run on the word 'shake' in the recitative, 'Thus saith the Lord.' But to treat the word 'desire' in the same way (there are forty-one notes to be sung to the second syllable) is merely stupid. Other words are mauled about in the same mischievous fashion. It has taken us till the late nineteenth century to realize the desirability of fitting the music to the words, and not stretching the words out like a sausage-skin to fit a previously conceived music scheme. We recognize, however, that such procedure, so common to the period, no more detracts from the ultimate value of the work, than its spots diminish the glory of the sun.

And how perennially fresh the music is! Individual preferences will always vary, but the present writer regards the first part of the aria, 'But who may abide the day of His coming,' as one of the finest of the composer's conceptions. No race has ever had a more deep-seated longing for anything or any one than the ancient Jews had for their Messiah. It was inwrought in the very fabric of their existence. What Hebrew mother was there but did not dream that she might be the destined one to give birth to the Lord's Anointed? And they were not to be disappointed. From them indeed would spring the Rod of Jesse for whom they so passionately craved. But the prophets were under no illusion as to Israel's unpreparedness to meet Him: so Malachi gives forth his trenchant and earnest warning: and Handel has caught the meaning of his message in tones of haunting and deeply felt pathos.

Almost all the choruses possess that drive and energy for which the composer is so justly famous. In the early part of the work the jubilation of the prophetic utterance, 'And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed,' is well expressed in a mass of tone that throbs with joy from beginning to end. No less impressive is the famous declamation, 'For unto us a Child is born.' Who can ever forget the overwhelming effect of the words, 'Wonderful, Counsellor,' when thundered out for the first time? Although the punctuation of the Authorized Version (which Handel, of course, followed) is now obsolete, and we have learned to read 'Wonderful Counsellor,' the majesty of the setting is in no way impaired. It is evident that this mighty chorus made a profound impression on Beethoven, for during his last illness, when he whiled away his time studying the works of his predecessor, he once exclaimed to a friend who was trying to cheer him up, 'My day's work is finished. If there were a physician that could help me, his name should be called Wonderful.'

Few numbers in the whole oratorio have touched the human heart more deeply than the soprano aria, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.' The music is the embodiment of the sure and certain hope of the Christian believer. The two opening notes for the words 'I know' could not possibly be improved upon. We are not unmindful of the fact that the words attributed to the patriarch Job are in all probability a mistranslation. Albeit, the words of the Authorized Version may be regarded as an inspired guess, especially having regard to the noble music in which they have been enshrined. We have no need to reject them in the light of the passionate belief of Paul, who knew what Job did not know, and who could, with joy more abundant, welcome the day when he would 'depart to be with Christ which is far better.'

It lies beyond the scope of this paper to describe all the famous numbers of the oratorio. We can, however, spare a glance for one or two others. To some people the well-known bass solo, 'The trumpet shall sound,' is a perennial attraction. The present writer, however, finds the trumpet obligato, so eagerly anticipated by its admirers, a little too obvious to be really impressive. The custom of procuring a special trumpeter for the occasion (sometimes in a special suit as well!) emphasizes its insistence almost to the point of childishness. We are reminded of a youngster's picture-book, with the captions, M is for man, T is for trumpet, and B is for the blast he blows on it. The 'Amen' chorus, too, divides people into two camps, some finding in it the very height of Handel's genius, others feeling that it scarcely makes the sublime conclusion that it ought, even while they recognize that it has a certain dignity and spaciousness. Is

there much point in the continuous reiteration of the word 'Amen'?

Whatever argument there may be on this and kindred matters, however, all unite in acknowledging the supreme glory of the 'Hallelujah' chorus. No doubt it is Handel's greatest effort. We have already recorded Haydn's verdict. Probably Beethoven had it in mind when he said, 'Go and learn of him how to achieve great effects with simple means'—a much harder task than some might think. Great choruses have been, and will continue to be written. But perhaps, notwithstanding Bach's 'Sanctus' in his *Mass in B Minor*, Brahm's chorus, 'Now death is swallowed up,' in the *Requiem*, and Elgar's 'Finale' to the *Apostles*, the 'Hallelujah' chorus stands by itself.

It is on the authority of Dr. Allott, Dean of Raphoe, that we learn that Handel said when he wrote it, 'I did think I did see all heaven before me and the great God Himself.' On 23rd March 1743, at Covent Garden Theatre, when a performance of the oratorio was being given, George II. rose at the singing of this chorus and remained standing throughout. This spontaneous tribute, which has been given by generation after generation ever since, is thoroughly deserved of the music. Perhaps the finest thing that can be said about it is that it is a worthy representation of the overpowering splendour of the words it depicts.

The music, although Handel's own, is not entirely original. It is derived in some small part from the well-known chorale 'Sleepers, Wake.' This is specially noticeable at the words, 'The Kingdom of this World is become,' which form what has been justly described as 'the dramatic centre of the work.' Some have seen in the falling notes of the scale a vivid picture of the world's kingdom going down to the feet of Christ. Immediately after, in vigorous contrast is the outburst 'the Kingdom of Our Lord and of His Christ.' Thence the chorus gathers ever-increasing power and majesty as it vociferates the grand climacteric of the Christian faith: 'and He shall reign for ever and ever, King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Hallelujah.'

. . . 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords—for ever!' In these days when the rising tide of barbarism threatens to submerge all that is fair and lovely, we may well ask, with a wild and desperate fear clutching at us 'whether these things be so?' This indeed is the hour of the evil one and the powers of darkness. And the shuddering cry goes up from a million torn and anguished hearts—'How long, O Lord, how long?' May the mighty inspiration of Handel, wedded to the noblest words of Scripture, speak to us in these darkest of all days as from God Himself, to strengthen and inspire us in our belief that the forces of evil simply cannot thwart His purposes: that He must reign till all enemies are put beneath His feet: and that He will give to our yearning and desolate souls 'songs of deliverance' and hymns of victory.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

St. Swithin's Day.

By the Reverend Sidney H. Price, Great Shelford, Cambridge.

'He did good, and gave us rain from heaven.'—Ac 14[17].

July 15th. St. Swithin's Day! Some people still have a belief that if it rains on St. Swithin's Day we shall have rain for the next forty days. It seemed to me that to find out the real facts one should inquire of the Observatory at Greenwich, so I have examined the records for the past twelve years, and I find this. Sometimes, when there was little or no rain on the 15th there has followed a wet period with fifteen or sixteen rainy days, and sometimes when St. Swithin's Day was really a wet day, a very low rainfall is shown for the next forty days. There seems to be no relationship between what happens on that day and the forty which follow.

We know very little about the man whose name is remembered by this day. He lived from about 800 to 862, in the reign of King Egbert, and had a reputation for being a very good and saintly man. The king entrusted him with the education of the young Prince Ethelwulf, who learned to think very highly of his teacher. When Ethelwulf became king he made Swithin Bishop of Winchester.

Many stories are told of the saintly bishop, most of them, however, are the 'believe it or not' story. For instance, one day a peasant woman on her way to market with a basket of eggs accidentally bumped into a workman and dropped her basket. The bishop, seeing her distress, prayed, and the broken eggs were all restored.

It is true, however, that he was long remembered for his humility, his kindness to the poor, and his good and simple life. He died on 2nd July 862, and was buried, according to his wishes, with humble folk in the churchyard. When the cathedral was rebuilt over a hundred years later, on 15th July 971, it was decided to remove his grave to a place of honour in the cathedral. The old tale says that to prevent the monks doing this, the saint caused the rain to fall so heavily for forty days that the work could not be carried out. But this part of the story is another 'believe it or not.'

Other countries have similar stories. In parts of France, in Flanders, in Germany, and Holland, and elsewhere, different dates with their own saints hold a similar place in the imagination of the people.

In England, 15th July is also known as 'Apple Christening Day.' It is said that after rain on this day, no matter how small or green the apples, they are fit to eat. I do not recommend you to try it, for to me they look as though they would cause trouble. One thing does seem true that, after a dry spell, rain now does help apples and other things in the garden to grow.

We will not then look displeased if on the 15th we have rain. We need have no fear that the next forty days will be wet, for that never happens. We will rather say that God in His goodness sends both rain and sunshine for our good, and, if we do think of the old Saint Swithin, let us remember him for his good and simple life, and ask God to make us like that, so that we too may be a gift of God to the world.

The Laugh of a Friend.

By the Reverend A. A. Mackenzie, B.D.,
Flemington, Victoria, Australia.

'Then was our mouth filled with laughter.'—Ps 126[2].

What wonderful things happened in Sydney during the days when we had the surprise coming of the American ships! The most wonderful of all, I think, was when a kookaburra lighted on the masthead of the flagship *Chicago* as she berthed at the wharf. There Jack took his perch and burst into a hearty cackle of laughter. Nothing could have been more fitting. For one thing, it 'provided the most perfect Australian welcome.' It added a note to the joyousness of the day that could not be found anywhere else in the whole wide world. Then, in the second place, it was *the welcome of a friend*.

Perhaps that is why the kookaburra laughs. He is such a friendly fellow. No one could ever say he is beautiful. He hasn't the dainty form of a willie-wagtail, but a quaint squat shape. He hasn't a sweet singing voice from a pretty little mouth, but a laugh from a great beak which he opens ever so wide. And what a friendly look! If you look at him and catch his eye the chances are he will laugh. And you'll wonder if he sees anything in you to laugh at. No, he doesn't; he laughs because he is a friendly fellow. People who meet you with a happy laugh are friendly people. You know, there are some people who do not seem to know how to laugh. The kookaburra is not like that. He is frank, honest, and hearty. He is a friend, and those American sailors who saw and heard Jack, probably for the first time, will never forget him.

Now, if I were to tell you that the Bible says we are to be like the kookaburra, what would you think? Of course, the Bible does not put it quite like that, but it does tell us to be friendly, to 'be kindly affectioned one to another.' I think that is what Jesus was, don't you? wonderfully friendly to every one. If He wasn't, those boys and girls from Salem would never have climbed up on to His knee? No one knows better than boys and girls if a man is friendly and to be trusted. What made them so sure of Him was His eyes and His smile. Friendliness was written all over His face. Many of the pictures we see of Jesus show us a sad face. But that, I am sure, is a big mistake. Why! that's the very thing Jesus told people to take care they did not have, "Be not of a sad countenance,' He said. 'Don't put on gloomy looks.' In Jesus' time, just as in ours, many people thought that to be good meant being gloomy. Jesus said, 'No! not at all. Don't you put on a long face like that.' You can be very sure that Jesus had the kind, laughing face of a friend.

A lady I knew came once to our parish to collect for orphan children in 'Kildonan,' the Church's Home. And I sent her to one man, and while I waited for her to come home I am afraid I enjoyed a little 'innocent merriment,' for I knew he was a very gloomy man. He was always looking miserable,

for he had a miserable, mean, grudging spirit. Of course, he grumbled away to my friend; and she, being what we call 'a hard case,' at last said, 'Well, you'll give me a smile, won't you?' Poor fellow, he knew nothing about the spirit of Jesus. How different was that good man, Robert Louis Stevenson, who made this his prayer:

'The day returns and brings us the petty round of irritating concerns and duties. Help us to play the man, help us to perform them *with laughter and kind faces*.'

Which do you think was more like Christ?

The Christian Year.

Fifth Sunday after Trinity.

The Success of Failure.

'It is enough; now, O Lord, take away my life.'—1 K 19[4].

One of the commonest foes the Christian has to face in his journey through life is that of discouragement. It may meet a beginner in the Christian life, when the first enthusiasm of the start is over and stern realities have to be faced. But discouragements are by no means confined to the beginning of the Christian life; they occur all the way. As has been said, 'Life is a trial trip all through,' and one of the heaviest burdens we have to bear is just this feeling which broke down the heart of the people in the wilderness when the Chronicler says of them: 'The soul of the people was much discouraged because of the way.'

1. What is *the cause of these discouragements* which so depress us at times? Sometimes it is hard to say. You meet a man and he says to you, 'I feel so depressed. Life looks all black to me.' And you say, 'Why are you so depressed? Any bad news?' But he can point to nothing. 'I can't tell what it is, but I feel so discouraged. At times I am tempted to give the whole thing up.' Such discouragements are to a large extent temperamental. There are some people born with a gloomy strain in their composition. They are like Mrs. Gummidge, the lone, lorn creature in Dickens' romance *David Copperfield*. Such people are often gentle and sweet in nature and are to be sympathized with, not blamed; yet it must be said that they do much to deteriorate the atmosphere by spreading germs of spiritual malaria all around and spoiling the enthusiasm and happiness of their fellows. It is an evil, if not a sin, to be a discourager.

But while discouragements are thus often causeless, at other times they have causes that are only too grimly real. How many, for example, are the discouragements which a business man feels to-day? He builds up for himself after years of toil a position of independence. Then in a moment, through the failure of some creditor, or the cruel combination of some rivals, he finds his business in ruins around him, and he himself, perhaps, branded as a defaulter. There is no harder experience than that, nothing which so tests a man's grit and grace. On the other hand, there is nothing that so impresses us with the courage of some men as the way in which after such an experience they take fresh heart and begin to build again what the selfishness or dishonesty of others has destroyed.

Sir Walter Scott wrote in his Diary after the news of his commercial disasters had reached him:

'I feel neither dishonoured nor broken down by the news I have received. I have walked my last in the domain which I have planted, sat for the last time in the halls which I have built; but death would have taken them from me if misfortune had spared me. Discouragement is to me a tonic and a bracer.'

2. This brings us to *the disguised blessings of discouragement*. We know its dangers. Its dangers are to give up the battle as useless, or to find refuge in those false stimulants which the drunkard and the opium-eater have recourse to in order to gain a temporary relief from the shadows of the mind. There is no safety there. That way death or madness lies. Our only hope in such an hour is to brace up our spirit afresh and go forward with teeth set and faces steeled to the hill of difficulty before us.

What are its blessings? One of these is *a great discipline of humility*. Uninterrupted success in life is apt to make us conceited, self-assertive, and overbearing. But discouragement takes the starch out of a man quicker than any other experience. We see that in Elijah at Horeb. After his great success at Carmel and the slaughter of eight hundred and fifty priests of Baal self-assurance oozed all out of the man away in the desert fleeing from the fury of Jezebel. He felt himself very weak then. 'I only am left and they seek my life to take it away.' But discouragements not only train us in humility, *they develop the will*. They bring out the real grit in a true man. It would be a great impoverishment of human biography if there were no discouragements in it. It is out of such experiences that are born the noblest of the world's heroes. We learn more from our failures than we do from our successes. It was in Horeb that Elijah got his noblest vision of God. It was from it that he went

forth to do his most permanent work: the appointment of his successor—the dethronement of Ahab—the enthronement of Jehu.

3. *We must turn our failures into successes.* For remember it is one thing *to have discouragements* and another *to be discouraged.* The first constitutes the temptation, the second is the yielding to it. To have discouragements and yet not to be discouraged is one of the greatest blessings our character can have. And how can we have it? In ways like these.

Refuse to be beaten. By resolutely rising up after your knock-down blow and going forward to face the music afresh as if nothing had happened. That is what God led Elijah to do at Horeb. 'Go, return,' He said, 'on the way to Damascus.' Dream no longer under thy juniper bush. Go back to the world with its toil and struggle and common duties and find in a life of service to God and man the true balm to your broken spirit.

Think of the many things in your life which are fitted to encourage you and try and fix your eyes on them to the exclusion of what is dark and painful. It was this that God did to Elijah. When the prophet said mournfully, 'I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life, to take it away,' God said to him, 'I have left me seven thousand men in Israel which have not bowed their knees unto Baal.' There is a verse in a poem once popular which runs something like this:

> Though dark and sable as a shroud,
> The inner side of every cloud
> Is bright and shining.
> I therefore turn my clouds about
> And always wear them inside out
> To show the lining.

Sometimes the cloud of life may seem so dark that it may be impossible to see any bright side to it, but if you only look long enough you will find it—if only in this—that it brings you nearer God and throws you back upon Him.

Look away from the present to the memories of a past God. Believe that what He has done for you then He will do for you again, even *now* if you only trust Him. That was the cure for his discouragement which the old Psalmist found when he cried in that most beautiful of all the Psalms of Discouragement in the Psalter, 'Why art thou cast down, O my soul; and why art thou disquieted in me? hope thou in God: for I shall yet praise him.' And then follows: 'Therefore will I remember thee from the Land of Jordan, from the mountains of Hermon and from the hill of Mizar.' What is the meaning of that interjection? Is it not a memory of some great good that he had received from the hand of God in these places. And what God has done for him in the past He can and will do for him in the future. So when we are discouraged in life, let this be our great refuge: 'Hope thou in God.' 'Because thou *hast* been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings *will* I rejoice.'[1]

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christian Courage.

BY THE REVEREND ERIC PARSONS, M.A., PH.D., HARROW.

'Patient in tribulation.'—Ro 12^{12}.

1. The New Testament assumes that trials and tribulations are characteristic of the Christian life. The Roman Church was not, as far as is known, actually enduring persecution at this time; but from his own experience, and that of his converts, Paul assumes that sorrow and suffering are the inevitable lot of the Christian. Thus in his earliest epistle he reminds his readers of the cost of Christianity: 'You started to copy us and the Lord, welcoming the word though it brought you heavy trouble.' And later, in connexion with the anxieties of that ancient church he says: 'Troubles are our lot, you know that well; for we told you beforehand, when we were with you, that we Christians are to have trouble.' In the Corinthian epistle he sums up in a phrase become classical the Christian reaction to this calamitous experience: 'Love endureth all things—is always brave.'

Our courage is always being challenged in one way or another. Tribulations change but tribulation remaineth. Whether we are Christians or not distress dogs our steps through life, the only difference being that the Christian's trials are perhaps more numerous and more keenly felt. The war constitutes such a challenge. For the majority it means hardship and disappointment. Irksome restrictions fret our nerves; natural anxiety for loved ones, strain of separation and grief over loss, will lower resistance still further. It is certain that, if we are not watchful, we shall become impatient or dispirited.

Light-hearted optimism would be altogether out of place in view of the human tragedy which is breaking hearts and homes and whole civilizations. But it is well to remember that we have no more excuse for despondency now than at any time.

[1] W. M. Mackay, *Problems in Living*, 196.

Life is always a grim grey mystery, with its minor tragedies and its monstrous iniquities. That voice of humanity, Shakespeare, confirms one's conviction that infinite woe overshadows man at every turn and time. 'What can be more impressive,' asks Charles Gore, 'than the evidence that is presented to us in the plays and sonnets of Shakespeare, if we seek to read them chronologically, that he passed from a genial acceptance of the spectacle of humanity, "good and bad together," to a profound gloom as he gazed deeper and deeper into it, and found himself confronted with some fundamental incapacity in men to be the thing they would be—some fundamental victory of passion and circumstance over feeble good—a mystery of ruin baffling all power of speculation to extract a meaning out of it?' Yes, Paul was right: 'troubles are our lot.' But more than all 'we Christians are to have trouble' in facing with faith such a world as we live in.

2. When we turn to the Bible to see what it has to say about the matter, we meet on almost every page with the kind of counsel given in our text. 'Be patient in tribulation,' says Paul. 'Steady patience is what you need,' echoes the epistle to the Hebrews. But there is something unsatisfactory about this exhortation, especially if you don't happen to be a very patient individual. It savours of the too painfully obvious. And our vague dissatisfaction is justified when we learn that the word 'patient' has more of the sense of bravery and effort than our English word. Paul's meaning, says C. A. Scott, may be most adequately conveyed by the phrase 'stand up to your troubles.' And that is surely the very word we need—just the sort of slogan to reinspire anybody as long as poor tormented humanity is able to stand on its legs at all.

Now Paul was not so foolish as to call on a man whose backbone was broken to stand up. Nor was he so simple as to suppose that people will face a sea of troubles if there is every prospect of their suffering the fate of a spiritual Canute. The ground of his optimism is nothing less than God. It is God who inspires steadfastness—'the God of patience and comfort;' that is to say, 'the God from whom we draw endurance and encouragement.' God inspires us, partly because we know His nature as revealed in Jesus to be love, but also because we experience through faith in Jesus His power in our lives. Thus in the fifth chapter we find Paul not merely 'patient in tribulation,' nor even 'standing up to his troubles,' but actually boasting about them. And he tells us exactly why.

By faith in Jesus he has begun to enjoy 'peace' with God; and by 'peace' he means not the sense of right relationship with God only, but also with his entire environment. His new 'standing' with God through Jesus has affected the whole of life's struggle and the spirit in which he faces it. Troubles do not depress him because, being at peace with God, things cannot in the last resort be against him in God's world. On the contrary, affliction may even be the means to greater moral and spiritual victories; for trouble produces endurance, endurance produces character (or approvedness), and character produces hope, because we have reached then a spiritual state which proves itself in trial. So, as Paul says, 'we triumph even in our troubles.'

3. The reader of Paul's epistles may feel sceptical about such an outcome of faith in any but the greatest of saints. Yet common experience commends this word of the Apostle and should encourage us to try it for ourselves. If a man gives his head a sufficiently hard knock a bump appears which he does not usually regard with any great satisfaction. But that bump is Nature's doctoring, her effort to repair the damage which he has sustained. The blood-vessels in the affected part enlarge, so that the necessary quantity of blood goes there, taking the fluids requisite for healing. The swelling is due to the vast congregation of healing and fortifying cells which immediately assemble upon need arising.

May we not believe that something not unlike this happens in the spiritual realm: that the moment a man is in trouble, mental and spiritual resources are rushed to his rescue? Do we not indeed know this to be a common fact of experience? 'A rapture,' says C. E. Montague, 'may visit a man suddenly faced with peril and opportunity in a battle or an accident. He is released—that is all you can say. Fear and desire, his two keepers through life, to preserve and enchain him, are suddenly gone, and he goes to self-sacrifice as lightly as a child draws its breath, with so perfect a freedom from all sense of effort, danger, or pain that presently he is surprised and abashed, and feels like a secret impostor when people credit him with heroism.' Paul would have us learn that Christ desires that rare rapture of the ordinary man to be the constant experience of the Christian. God provides the means for us to stand up to our troubles in the home and in our daily work, just as surely as He provides the means which enable the martyr and hero to display superhuman fortitude and endurance in persecution or peril. Have faith that

the divine providence is equal to all your anxieties and needs.

This is not merely a word of comfort for which to feel vaguely grateful. It is also a challenge. It is imperative that we receive it and act upon it. For while God offers spiritual succour and sufficiency to the man who will have faith in Him, the prospect of spiritual collapse confronts that man who lightly despises this word of God. There is a negative and a positive side to the matter we have been considering. 'Woe unto you,' says Ecclesiasticus, 'that have lost your patience!' 'And what will ye do when the Lord shall visit you?' 'In your patience ye shall win your souls,' says Jesus. Hold out steadfast and you shall win! Through all the New Testament there runs the same refrain: 'He that endureth (holds out to the very end) the same shall be saved.' Win or lose. These are the alternatives facing us; for, as Paul insists, 'God will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life.' But by the grace of God we may regard the prize as already won, since God in Christ supplies the spiritual resources requisite for all our needs.

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Great Prayer.

'And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.'—Mk 9[24].

We know neither the name nor the history of the father of the lunatic child in Mk 9, but that cry of his, 'I believe; help thou mine unbelief', is like an open window through which we look into his heart. Instead of rejoicing, as parents do, over a developing mind and a healthy body he was mourning over alarming fits and even suicidal frenzy. There is no need to ask how many fruitless visits he has paid to physicians. Therefore when the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth was reported to him he was ready to make one more effort.

The poor boy lay there in the centre of a mixed crowd, made up of inquisitive passers-by, and malicious scribes, and mortified disciples. Jesus' appearance on the scene had been followed by a fresh paroxysm on the invalid's part, so that everything seemed to call for immediate action. None the less our Lord paused, for a moment delaying to heal. Before curing the son, He would bless the father. The dialogue that follows resembles at first that between any physician and any parent. To calm the other, Jesus asks a common unexciting question: 'How long has this been going on?' 'From childhood,' is the answer: 'but if Thou canst do anything, take pity on us and help us.' 'If *thou* canst,' replies our Lord—the difficulty is not on My side, but yours. 'All things are possible to him that believeth.' Then it was that the man, who could not have borne much more, so cruel had the strain been, broke forth in this cry of struggling fear and hope: 'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.'

So *belief and unbelief may lie side by side in the same mind.* We are able to distinguish in his exclamation these two tones—intense eagerness and dark misgiving. On the one hand was eagerness, springing from love for his boy coupled with anticipations kindled by what he had heard of Jesus' power and kindness. The mere rumour of His approach had led him thither on the faint chance of cure. Expectation, besides, had been quickened by the promise lying in Christ's decisive word: 'Bring him hither to Me,' as well as by the tone and glance with which the command was spoken. But with the eagerness there mingled fear. The case was a desperate one, of long standing, and the disciples had completely failed. And in addition, the very words 'all things are possible to him that believeth' had created a new anxiety. What if his faith, thus challenged by Jesus, were to prove so feeble that nothing could be done, and the boy be condemned for the father's failure? What if the gift of healing hung too high for his faint trust to touch and grasp?

Too often we talk as if belief and unbelief were mentally incompatible; but this leaf out of a human document, this transcript of a simple, earnest man's experience, proves clearly it is not so. Have we never felt this inward tug-of-war between these two impulses? One half of our heart is for trusting God, the other is for suspecting or defying Him. One voice urges that the sorrow which has fallen on us is the providential touch of a Father's hand; another cries that to talk of Providence is folly. Every Christian soul is a battlefield for these two. Good people occasionally speak as if by some sudden magic transformation we could fling off the temptation to unbelief for good and all. Experience does not bear them out. Moods of mistrust and chilling suspicion may return, and have to be fought and overthrown afresh; and though Christ's power undoubtedly may be reckoned on for the struggle, the danger and the pain are not a whit less real. These things have to be said, not that they may infect us with dread or cowardice, but that, being forewarned, we

may be also forearmed. It is always time to pray, 'Lord, increase our faith.' Samuel Johnson used to say, in his rough fashion, that 'every man is a rascal when he is sick'; and, if we are candid, we shall confess that too frequently we have been sceptics when we are in trouble. That is a memory that might well keep us just and tender to those of little faith.

But it is *the kindling light of faith which reveals our lack of it.* This man's heart was drawn out to Christ for the sake of his tortured boy; more and more he felt that healing was to be found in that wonderful power or nowhere. The tiny flame of earnest desire and apprehension lit up the surrounding shadows and disclosed a darkness which would have remained unfelt, unseen, and undeplored, but for that sudden flashing of the light. So his discovery of the shadows was a proof that the light was shining now. Nothing but faith makes a man sensitive to the presence of its opposite. This principle, that we grow conscious of many things only because we have become aware of their opposite, is one which we constantly meet with. A youth may consider his playing of the violin very creditable until he hears the performance of a master; then he goes home tempted to put his instrument behind the fire. Just so in the sphere of our relations to God. When there comes upon us a sense of concern at our distance from the Father, and we begin to long to get nearer, that is a sign that we *are* getting nearer, and that His great nature, like a magnet, is beginning to stir us into movement. Drowning is said to be a painless affair; it is the coming back to life that is torture, and especially the first breaths drawn after resuscitation. But painful as the experience may be, it is a small price to pay for life.

We see, too, how *this man used to the utmost his actually existing faith.* We shall agree in this, that there is something wonderfully engaging in his directness, his honest plainness of speech. He could not hide his mistrust, and he could not bear, either, that mistrust should have it all its own way; so, in his appeal to Jesus he brings both his faith and his mistrust out candidly, side by side. Our prayers would do us much more good if they were oftener modelled on this pattern. Too frequently in prayer we act as people do who call in a doctor, then tell him nothing of their worst symptoms. Let us be real in our fellowship with God; reality is a part of reverence. In one of his epistles St. Paul gives expression to a fear lest his converts should lapse from that habit of simple unrestrained confidence and candour which ought to mark the dealings of a Christian man with his Lord. Where that habit exists, it is the surest defence against disloyalty.

But perfect candour has two sides. In this man's case it called for the acknowledgment of doubt and fear, yet no less truly it demanded a sincere employment of the faith already present. So he resolved to follow that faith out and out, every yard it would take him. Feeble and flickering though it was, at any rate the light showed the next few steps.

Out of this father's action we may pluck the truth that we make advance, and gain power, only as we give our best impulses their own way from the beginning. Never be deterred by any doubts from following out what you *do* believe. Remember that your convictions rise out of knowledge, while doubt is the offspring merely of ignorance. Whatever your grip on God, the one way to deepen and tighten it is to hold fast that which you have. Most of the difficulties of the Christian life are solved by the simple expedient of going on. Put out to interest your one pound of faith, and before long it will have gained you five; for to him that hath shall be given.

And if we know anything about ourselves, we must know, like this tossed and driven soul, that we cannot control the movements of the inner life. Faith and unfaith do not come and go at our command. We may be haunted by thoughts we loathe; we may be hemmed round by prejudices and dislikes which, we feel, shame the followers of a loving Lord; affliction may bring us to ask against our better will whether God's care is but a fable. If things are ever so with us, at least we may cast ourselves down into the depths of Christ's sympathy and retreat under the shelter of His power.[1]

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Pharisee and the Publican.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, M.A., EALING.

'This man went down to his house justified rather than the other.'—Lk 18^{14}.

Two types of worshippers are presented in this parable and they form a study in comparatives. Neither is approved outright, both are imperfect but one is better than the other. To get the truth of the story let us forget our natural bias against the Pharisee and see both men at worship in church to-day.

The first illustrates religion along the level of

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *The Highway of God*, 207.

ordinary life. Here is a man who lives a good life. Fair and just in his dealings with others, his moral conduct is all that could be desired. He is regular in attendance at Public Worship and his givings are up to the standard required by the law of God. This man is not to be dismissed lightly. Hypocrisy is an ever-present danger, but at his best he represents people who are pulling their weight in modern life. Upholders of law and order, good neighbours, subscribers to all good causes, they form an important, almost an essential part of the community. What then is wrong with this man's worship? That is revealed in the telling phrase, 'he prayed thus with himself.' His worship was along the level of ordinary life. There was no sense of height save that of his own position, standing up above his fellows at worship, feeling superior to them. He thanked God he was not as other men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican!

The second man exemplifies religion in the depths. Here it is all confession, a going down and down. He would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven and all he could say was 'Lord, be merciful unto me a sinner.' At once we know an element of true worship is present, that he had got to the point where worship is real. And we are not surprised at the comparison which follows when both men were back home again, and they were thinking it all over. One man has a sense of futility. After a week of good sound living why this disappointing Sunday? The other with the memory of a bad week, perhaps something more than usually outrageous the shame of which had driven him in contrition to church, found that the service had helped him.

'Justified rather than the other'—a study in comparatives. It is important to stress this or else wrong conclusions could be drawn from the story, as if our Lord had put a premium on sin with a hint of disparagement of virtuous living. To think that virtue is pilloried and sin glossed over is to misunderstand the parable. 'Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?' Even so we find ourselves asking, must there be sin to make worship real? If worship was completely described in terms of the experiences of these two men, the answer to that question would be, yes. But there is one factor still to be accounted for. In terms of dimensions the first man illustrates length and breadth, the level of life; the second shows clearly the need of depth. There is still another dimension, height, and we shall find the answer to the question in a definition of perfect worship as the worship of three dimensions, height, depth, length and breadth.

Let us therefore consider the Pharisee again. He gives thanks for his good life and at once we feel the thanksgiving is wrong. Why? Because there is no height in it. What a thanksgiving it might have been, for life itself, for the special opportunities of his life through his position and his strength of character. For worship itself, the gift of communion with the unseen. So we are led on to our own day and worship, thanksgiving for the love of God in Christ. Oh, the passion and the tenderness of that thanksgiving! We have heard it on the lips of our friends, in the thrill of singing such lines as

> Behold th' amazing gift of love
> the Father hath bestowed
> On us, the sinful sons of men,
> to call us sons of God!

And we remember a great thanksgiving in these words, 'I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.' The first essential in true worship is thanksgiving, indeed, more than that, it is the creative power in worship. This thought of thanksgiving can be described as a sense of height. Isaiah recalls the beginning of what was to be for him a transforming religious experience. 'I saw the Lord,' he writes, 'high and lifted up!' What a confession naturally, inevitably, follows. Just because there is height in the thanksgiving, there is depth in the confession. And the depth is greater far than any sinner of the publican type could ever comprehend. Indeed, in this description of religion under the figure of 'dimensions,' the depth can be calculated, it is in proportion to the height. And in worship at its best neither can be measured. Nor is it in any way unreal, forced, or artificial. When one is gripped by the thought of the love of God in Christ, when even an inkling of what that truth means penetrates the mind and heart, then the outburst of thanksgiving is immediately followed by a realization of utter inadequacy, a swift review of all we have failed to be and to do in response to this great gift. Every instinct in us tells us that 'love so amazing, so divine, demands our life, our soul, our all.' Who of us has answered that challenge in any way adequately? It may seem paradoxical, but it corresponds to fact, to say that the profound depth of confession is found in the experience of the saint rather than the sinner. It is the direct result of the height of his thanksgiving.

Again, the third dimension follows naturally and

inevitably, length and breadth. Such thanksgiving and such confession can only result in a dedication or a rededication of one's life to the service of God. And again a calculation can be made.

Length and breadth are in proportion to height and depth. And again it is true to say that in worship at its best none of these can be measured at all, but there is a regulative principle—given a height so high that it cannot be measured, then follows a depth lower than the lowest deeps and inevitably there will ensue a length and breadth right across the whole of life. We began this study of the parable by a description of a man who gave thanks for his good life. If that had been the glad offering of one to whom much had been given and who therefore gave much, then our Lord's comparison would never have been made. But he prayed thus with himself, 'God, I thank thee I am not as other men—I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.' How true, how pitifully true! And so the limitations, the narrow limitations of this man's life can be vividly pictured, we can just see him in all his littleness, a life without any sense of height, a life along the level. Better the second man—at least he had depth—but better far the true worshipper with height and depth, and then length and breadth reaching out to the uttermost parts of the world; and with all the undeniable, almost inescapable, human limitations, that has been true of Christian worship through the centuries. The height and depth have been locked in the secrets of spiritual experience, the resulting length and breadth have been written in the glorious history of the spread of the Christian faith and life. Christian worship means high thanksgiving, deep confession, and then the far horizon of the Kingdom of God.

St. Paul and Nature *(continued)*.

By the Reverend W. W. Gauld, M.A., Aberdeen.

There still remains to be noted one other particular aspect of Nature, the inevitable contrast between night and day, darkness and light. It is perhaps the commonest metaphor in language, certainly in the language of religion; but it is precisely in handling the commonplace that a man reveals the distinction of his mind. St. Paul's references are too numerous to quote, but one or two of the more striking instances may be cited.

One such instance has been beautifully and suggestively expanded in these lines from Myers' 'Saint Paul':

> Lo, for the firmament in spaces splendid
> Lighteth her beacon-fires ablaze for thee:
>
> Holds them and hides and drowns them and discovers,
> Throngs them together, kindles them afar,
> Sheweth, O Love, Thy multitude of lovers,
> Souls that shall know Thee and the saints that are.
>
> Look what a company of constellations!
> Say can the sky so many lights contain?
> Hath the great earth these endless generations?
> Are there so many purified thro' pain?

That vision of the future triumphs of Christ first came to St. Paul as he 'looked through prison bars' and saw the lamplit dome of a Mediterranean night. I wonder if, on just such a night, the beauty and brilliance of the 'heavenly bodies' first spoke to his heart of the wonder of the Life Beyond (1 Co $15^{40f.}$). What we do know is that the thought of the little struggling companies of the saints scattered here and there in the darkness of the pagan world, so far from depressing him set his heart adreaming, just as in the initial success of His disciples Jesus 'beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven' (Lk 10^{18}): 'You shine like stars in a dark world; hold fast the word of life, so that I can be proud of you on the Day of Christ' (Ph $2^{15f.}$ Moffatt).

As a companion picture to that I would adduce the famous verses at the end of the thirteenth chapter of Romans, which are for ever associated with the conversion of St. Augustine, yet have an intrinsic beauty that challenges attention. Shakespearian critics know to their cost how dangerous it is to deduce a man's calling in life from the metaphors he uses; but it is a legitimate exercise of the imagination to find in a poet's language not only 'the echo of a great soul' but also the marks of his actual experience. In any case, we have high authority for it, that a poem means what the

reader finds in it. Well, here is one of the great passages in the writings of St. Paul, a purple passage with a singularly daring metaphor: '*the armour of light*.' I venture to pass on a suggestion which has been made for its interpretation.

Paul was in Corinth when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, the guest of one Gaius. Imagine him burning the midnight oil at his task, until the first faint streaks of dawn begin to glimmer across the Gulf of Ægina. The silence of early morning is rudely broken by the shouts of late revellers in the streets. When he looks out, he sees the castle ramparts and a Roman sentry pacing there clad in armour agleam with the rays of the rising sun. His mind full of the impressions of that hour, he continues his letter: 'The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof' (Ro 13^{12-14}). It is noble writing, however you take it.

There is another morning scene in the letters of Paul, which is of special interest because it describes the supreme event of his life. That experience on the road to Damascus pervades the thought of the Apostle. It was the burden of his preaching and its radiant memory illumines every letter he wrote. But nowhere is it more strikingly described than in the classic passage in the fourth chapter of 2 Corinthians where suddenly the imagination of the Apostle flames up like a tropical dawn: 'God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (4^{6}). The Apostle is speaking of those who shun the light, and (to quote Dr. Glover) 'he draws a picture of a life where all the windows of the soul are thrown open, where the sun searches every corner of the room' (*Paul of Tarsus*, 102). But it is no ordinary dawn he has in mind here. The coming of that 'light from heaven, above the brightness of the sky,' is comparable only to the First Dawn when God said: '*Fiat Lux!*' It was 'a new creation' (2 Co 5^{17}), as fresh and wonderful as the First Creation, 'when the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy' (Job 38^{7}). That was the master light of all his seeing. It still remains, briefly and very inadequately, to indicate how far it led him into the ultimate secret of Nature, and shaped his thought about the Universe and that

> far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves.

Let me repeat what I said at the beginning that there is no intention of comparing Jesus and Paul as interpreters of Nature. They were not merely dissimilar minds: what is much more important, in personal experience the one was original and the other derivative. The best we can say of Paul is Deissmann's estimate: 'the first in Christ.' But he was that—nothing less, and among other things he learned to look at Nature with the eyes of his Lord. If he began his education at the feet of Gamaliel, he finished it as a disciple of Jesus.

Forgetfulness of this led to the once popular cry, 'Back to Jesus!' which, in its turn, helped to produce the modern cult of Humanism. A sentimental reading of the Gospels has hidden the deeper implication of the teaching of our Lord. The realism of the parables of Jesus is not due to artistry or the felicity of a poet. As Professor C. H. Dodd says, 'it arises from a conviction that there is no mere analogy, but an inward affinity, between the natural order and the spiritual order.' Since they are in fact one order, 'you can take any part of that order and find in it illumination for other parts. . . . This sense of the divineness of the natural order is the major premiss of all the parables' (*The Parables of the Kingdom*, 21 f.). With unerring insight Paul grasped this central truth. It was not unaided insight. It was the insight of one who had already seen with piercing clearness that 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself' (2 Co 5^{19}). Jesus did not come to tell us with matchless eloquence that

> God's in his heaven—
> All's right with the world.

He came to show us the nature of Divine Love, what it cost and meant. Here is no Pathetic Fallacy, which finds in Nature a response to every transient mood. For Paul there was a deep underlying unity between 'Nature red in tooth and claw' and 'the corruption of man's heart'; the Passion of Christ was the flame-flower of 'that Love which moves the sun and other stars.' 'We preach Christ crucified . . . Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God' (1 Co $1^{23f.}$). The Cross is the key to the mysteries not only of the destiny of man but also of that world of Nature to which he belongs. 'For the earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason of him who sub-

jected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now' (Ro 8^{19-22}). We do not always look for Kipling among the prophets, but some lines of his are in the Pauline vein:

> To-night, God knows what thing shall tide,
> The Earth is racked and fain—
> Expectant, sleepless, open-eyed;
> And we, who from the Earth were made,
> Thrill with our Mother's pain.

Is that unexpected comment an echo of the poet's experience in Mother India?

At first sight there seems to be a suggestion of Pantheism in the Apostle's language. Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy cites Edward Caird to that effect, but deprecates the use of speculative categories in the interpretation of this passage. 'What we find in it,' he says, 'is rather the poetry of the religious imagination' . . . 'in harmony with the profoundest institutions of those who have

> a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things.'[1]

[1] *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, 336 f.

Paul was first and last a Jew, and his thought is pure Hebrew, a commonplace of the Prophets: his glowing eloquence is that thought became incandescent, through contact with the Spirit of Christ.

For finally—and this is perhaps one of the lessons we still have to learn of Paul—the starting-point of all his thinking, as it was the mainspring of all his activity, was the Cross. He did not explain Christ by Nature, did not regard Him, as we are apt to do, as the crown and consummation of an evolutionary process: he interpreted Nature through Christ—Christ and Him crucified. 'We may say indeed,' to quote Gwilym O. Griffith, 'that Paul's interest in Nature was evangelical. It is Paul's sense of the quickening and redeeming life of Christ, begun as an experience of redeeming grace in his own soul, and growing till he could set no bounds to it—this sense of grace and redemption it is which throbs at the centre of his thought concerning Nature' (*St. Paul's Life of Christ*, 70). This truth finds its supreme expression in the Kenotic passage of the second chapter of Philippians, with its triumphant climax: 'Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father' (2^{9-11}).

Contributions and Comments.

The Exegesis of Isaiah xl. 5, 6.

Verse 5. There are two possible translations of this verse:

(*a*) And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see (it) together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken.

(*b*) And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed: and all flesh shall see together that the mouth of the Lord hath spoken.

The first is the translation of the English versions. It is supported by Jerome, and popularized by Handel's *Messiah*. Septuagint supports it to the extent that it makes the main break of the verse after 'together' and not after 'revealed.' Actually Septuagint has 'and all flesh shall see the salvation of God,' this being doubtless due to a reminiscence of the Greek of Ps 98^{3}. None of those Hebrew MSS. which frequently assimilate to Septuagint has the addition.

The second was proposed by the mediæval Jewish scholar, D. Qimchi. We hold that he was right. Actually he is following the correct Massoretic accents, according to which there is an athnach at the end of the first clause, and a zaqeph qaton at the end of the second. This makes the main break in the verse come after 'revealed.' R. Levy[1] says that the Massoretic accents do not support D. Qimchi. We presume that he is assuming that the Massoretic tradition gives zaqeph qaton in both places. If that

[1] *Deutero-Isaiah*: a Commentary (1925), 116.

were correct then the usual translation is justified. These accents are actually found in some editions, notably Athias 1667, and its successors, including some of the editions which are dependent on van Hoogt. It is found in the Letteris edition of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and so is the reading familiar to many readers of the Hebrew Bible. From this edition it finds its way into Chief Rabbi Hertz's recent edition of the Pentateuch and Haftorahs. The cause of the trouble is, in part, that Johann Leusden omitted to correct the error of the first Athias Bible of 1661. Baer[1] rightly says that all the best witnesses have athnach, and that the zaqeph qaton is nothing more than an hereditary error in the more recent editions.

Verse 6. Our consideration of this verse is concerned primarily with the meaning of the word חסד, the usual translation of which is 'all the *goodliness* thereof.' This is equivalent to Luther's *Güte*, and is a very clever rendering. It retains something of the 'goodness, kindness,' which, according to the Oxford Lexicon (Brown, Driver, Briggs), is the meaning of חסד, whilst at the same time it preserves the traditions of all the versions except only that of the Targum. Septuagint has δόξα, and similarly the Syro-hexapla ܫܘܒܚܐ, and Jerome and the Clementine Vulgate *gloria eius*. The Old Latin makes it quite clear that the suffix is, in its opinion, to be taken to refer to Man, and so has *gloria hominis*, and in this it is followed by the Arabic Version. The Syriac goes so far as to translate ܫܦܝܪܘܬܐ 'beauty, charm,' which is not its usual word either for חסד or for חן, or even, for that matter, for יפי.

Evidently these versions did not know what to make of this unique use of חסד. Septuagint, for instance, could not use ἔλεος, its regular translation, as also it is that of Aquila, Symmachus, and the Quinta and Sexta versions. Neither could they very well use δικαιοσύνη, which occurs five times in the Septuagint of Genesis and twice in Exodus. They did not choose (rightly) to use χάρις which is found thrice in Esther, once for חסד, once for חן, and apparently once for both. So Septuagint thought of the splendour and glory of the flower of the field, and used δόξα. Syriac thought of the beauty of flowers, for the same word is used in Pr 1[9] of an ornament. It may, however, have been due to a confusion between the meanings of the two words חסד and חן, such as is apparent in Est 2[9], and in Ecclus 7[19] 40[17] and (?) 40[22]. A similar confusion is evident in Whitehouse, 'Isaiah' (*Century Bible*, ii. 54), where the meaning 'charm' is suggested as a sound rendering.

[1] *Liber Jesaiæ* (1872), 76.

Because of these versions which we have cited immediately above, the commentators have suggested such emendations as הודו or חסנו or הדרו. They all assume that the Massoretic Text is wrong. As a matter of fact it is correct, as the Targum very well knew. The interpretation of the Targum is 'All the wicked are like grass, and all their strength תוקפיהון is like the produce of the field. The grass withers, and its flower fades, because a wind from the presence of God has blown upon it. Wherefore the wicked among the people are reckoned as grass. The wicked dies and his thoughts perish, but the fiat of God stands for ever.' Here the Targum interprets חסדו as 'his strength,' meaning thereby his ability to continue 'in one stay,' *i.e.* his steadfastness, durability, reliability. An examination of the context in *vv.*[6-8] shows that this is exactly the sense intended. The contrast is between Man who soon ceases to be, and the Word of God which abides for ever. Man is like the grass and the flower of the field. The similarity is not because of any splendour, nor because they are beautiful, but because of their evanescent character. Man is like 'the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven.'

Not only does a rendering such as 'reliability,' 'steadfastness,' fit the context and make the contrast clearer, but it is correct, and is exactly the real meaning of the word חסד. In an article entitled 'Ḥen and Ḥesed in the Old Testament,'[2] Dr. W. F. Lofthouse shows that there is a clear distinction in the Old Testament between the two words chen and chesed. The first word 'is used but rarely of God; chiefly of men between whom there is or can be no specific bond or covenant.' The second word, however, which is the word with which we are concerned here, is essentially a covenant word, and stands primarily for that loyalty which should persist between the parties to a covenant. Together with the Hebrew word אמת, it stands for the fact that God can be relied on. That is the point of the prophet in these verses. Man is like the grass, which cannot be relied on, but the Word of God is steadfast and sure.

In conclusion, it will be seen that the result of our suggestions is the same in each case. We have suggested that *v.*[5] should be translated to mean that all mankind will see for themselves the demonstration of the sureness of God's Word. When the valleys are exalted and so forth, they will see God's glory (honour, success), and will realize that His Word has been fulfilled. Further, in *v.*[6], we have

[2] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, X. (1933), i., 29–35. See also C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks* (1935), 60.

suggested that the contrast is that which is specifically stated in *v.*[8] :

The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.

Both verses now fit in exactly with the argument of the book. The prophet's task, certainly in the first half, is to convince the exiles that their God is powerful enough to rescue and redeem them. He therefore is continually showing the contrast between God the Creator, and all created things, whether in earth or sea or sky, or even the idol gods of Babylon. On the basis of this, the prophet's message is that God has spoken, and the Word which He has spoken He can and will perform. This continued reiteration of the steadfastness of the Word of God is characteristic, *e.g.* 40^{21} 41^{26} 43^{12} 44^{8} 45^{23} 48^{5}, etc. It will be seen, then, that these two verses may be said to be, in some degree, preliminary statements of the argument of the whole book.

NORMAN H. SNAITH.

Headingley College, Leeds.

Calvin's Age and Ours.

FOR the past five or six years I have had opportunity of making a detailed study of Calvinism, and I find now an interest in looking back over the period of study and recording some of the advantages gained. Some points I think worth passing on.

First, it has been for me a good experience to be compelled to take a comprehensive view of the sum of Christian doctrine. In his *Institutes* Calvin gives an exposition of Christianity as he understands it, covering the whole ground and maintaining a reasonable perspective; so that at the end there emerges a clear idea of Christian dogma as a whole. What is the sum-total of Christian knowledge? What is it that an instructed Christian is supposed to believe? These questions are answered; so that from the book one gets an idea of the several parts fitted into a comprehensive unity. At once one notes the difference between that age and ours. We tend to approach theology from the point of view of particular problems, such as that of the person of Christ, or that of the interpretation of the Lord's teaching. We thus deal with aspects; and to a large extent they remain aspects. We specialize on points—important points, no doubt; but we miss the compelling power of the whole. The truth is that we assume in our theological teaching that the student begins with this comprehensive view, take it for granted that he knows Christian theology in its main outlines, then proceed to make him wise at disputed points. I have learned that the assumption is unwarranted. The student of to-day simply does not know. And, moreover, one can be a student of modern theology for a very long time without ever feeling the compelling power of Christian dogma as a whole. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that there are few men in our ministry to-day who would not get a new conception of Christian truth by steadily reading through from beginning to end the *Institutes* or some similar book. And this in spite of criticisms that would readily suggest themselves. Calvin's system may at points be woefully defective, but the fact that it is a system reveals one of the chief weaknesses of our modern position. We have ideas, Christian ideas many of them; but we lack the co-ordination of them into a coherent and cogent system. Yet nothing less than a complete system, one would think, can match the confusion of our time.

Then am I wrong in thinking that the standard of Christian education in the hey-day of Calvinism was much higher than it is now? One gathers that the average Christian of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, particularly in Nonconformist circles, could not only argue intelligently on points of controversy, but also had a fairly good idea of the dogmatic system as a whole, and on occasion could present it. It is indeed one of the great triumphs of Calvinism that it succeeded to a remarkable degree in giving a common mind to the masses. Everybody knew the Christian scheme beginning with God, man, and sin, and finding its consummation in the atonement and sanctification. There was a common denominator of Christian thought, and in some way this was communicated to the average Christian and through him to the majority of men in the nation. Thus there was a definiteness which contrasts with the vagueness of our own day. Perhaps we might do well to study the methods of propaganda whereby Calvin and his successors attained their results. If the Reformation was a revival of religion it was a revival based on thought, not on evanescent emotionalism. And the thought got down to the common man. The preaching, as we know, was the constant reiteration of the dogmatic scheme. Its aim was much more directly to instruct the mind on this one theme than is ours. It limited itself severely, but if it put blinkers on the eyes of people, it did so that they might see more steadily and clearly the things that are essential. Thus it was more like a river than a marsh.

One obvious effect of this comprehensive outlook was the unvarying emphasis on God. In the centre

of the system, He remained there. Religion is relationship with Him. This fact is never lost sight of and never blurred by over-emphasis on secondary relationships. Man has to face up to himself as he appears in the sight of God. This is his first duty, his starting point, his primary need ; and the whole dogmatic system is conceived from this standpoint and aims at instructing man to this end. Its task is not first to fit man into society, nor to enable him to adjust his relationship with his neighbours, but first to get him right with God. Thus the *religious* life is visualized in clear-cut fashion as the true life.

One has only to read Calvin to realize how in the modern world the ethical has in many quarters taken precedence over the religious. Ethical problems have loomed large in recent thinking and preaching, and rightly so, for the application of the gospel to life is an ever-present task of the Christian advocate. But what if there is so much application that the gospel itself is lost sight of ? It may be due to our lack of a coherent and complete dogmatic system that we have all found it easy to discuss ethical questions, not realizing always that we were relegating to the background the fundamental problem of man's relationship to God. Anyway, a reading of Calvin makes one think concerning the relative importance of the various notes of Christian truth. There are some old bells which might well be sounded again.

Also in the ethical aspect of the religion the attitude of Calvin's age was far different from ours, whether rightly or wrongly. Here again God came first. In our day the main consideration seems to be the nature and need of man. Ethical teaching keys itself up either to the happiness and good of the individual or to the well-being of society. The appeal is on the basis of sympathy with human need or on some idea of the equality of man and the rights of personality. The point is that action is demanded for man's sake. Calvin knows little or nothing of this. With him all Christian action is for the glory of God, done because God wills and ordains it. Thus it is cut loose entirely from man's worth. There is no question whether the needy is deserving or otherwise. Nor is the motive for it sympathy. The great motive is that God's glory may be furthered.

A great deal of discussion could arise as to the respective merits of these two points of view. Sympathy has gone a long way in the modern world and has sustained noble endeavour. But one wonders whether it can deal adequately with the world's evil, whether it is a stable enough basis for the long-continued patient effort which alone can bring redemption. In view of present events many, not without reason, doubt whether the ideal state of society can rest on fellow-feeling between man and man, unless such fellow-feeling is rooted in conviction concerning God. If so, then Calvin was near the truth ; we must begin with God and His redemption rather than with man and his need. In other words, a theology is required for the redemption of society, and a vital religion in the people as its indispensable foundation. This would indicate that the authority of God and His command ought to be spoken of more than the brotherhood of man. Not that this latter idea is false or valueless, but again a secondary idea must not be allowed to usurp the place of the primary.

Then with this humanistic basis of ethical appeal goes the prevailing sentimentalism. Haven't we sentimentalized religion too much till God has become an indulgent being who scarcely counts, and Jesus Christ little more than an amiable drawing-room figure ? Grace has been whittled down to graciousness and love a 'covering up of sins' by simply not admitting them. The stern notes of repentance and judgment have been soft-pedalled. Many who have not read Calvin are feeling this. But one needs to read Calvin or some kindred writer to realize fully how much the appeal in our churches is on the purely emotional level, and how far the religion has sunk towards a mere humanitarian good-will, wherein kindness is the chief virtue, while humility, as against pride, is foreign coin. One can fairly confidently predict that in the immediate future there will be a reaction in our Church against the romanticism which still holds us. But can the reaction be on right lines unless it is the outcome of a more adequate theology ?

It would be absurd to argue that we must go back to Calvin—this in spite of the Barthian emphasis. We shall not go back, but rather forward to a new synthesis in which the real values even of romanticism will be preserved. The argument here rather is that a close study of Calvin's period, or indeed any period far removed from our own, is a great help, enabling us to see our own time in right perspective and to form a judgment concerning both its good features and its bad. Our theology, defective as it is, has advantages over that of Calvin. These I have not thought it necessary to indicate. My point is that from the study of Calvin in detail comes—or at least has come to me—a finer appreciation of the needs of our own time and indication of the way in which perhaps we ought to tread.

ARTHUR DAKIN.

Baptist College, Bristol.

Entre Nous.

'Putting Our House in Order.'

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. have just published a book (3s. 6d. net) with the above title. The chapters are written by various bishops and clergy of the Church of England and in the Foreword there is a long list, headed by the Archbishop of York, of those who commend the book to the careful attention of the members of the Church of England. The main purpose of the book is to advocate certain reforms 'which, if carried out, will promote the efficiency of the Church's work, by removing some of the present economic anomalies and ensuring a fairer and more enlightened use of its resources. . . . We do not wish to make exaggerated claims. It would be absurd to argue that any economic change can of itself transform a lazy, domineering or ill-tempered priest into a true minister of the Gospel. But it is worth asking whether some measure of the moral and spiritual inefficiency of the clergy—and to moral and spiritual inefficiency we must all admit—is not attributable to their entanglement in an economic system within the Church itself which is sub-Christian, which is in many respects a far too close reflection of the un-Christian economic system of the world.'

The basic principle which is advocated is that every priest should be paid a stipend which would enable him to discharge his services to the Church efficiently; and the needs of his family would be taken into consideration. Family allowances are therefore advocated, larger groupings and more team work. It is a plea for big changes in the use of men and money. In a very clear and telling way the defects of the present endowment system are brought out. 'The inequalities between benefices are gross, glaring, and irrational. . . . They make the clergy think more about preferment than is good for their souls' health or for the quality of their work. . . . Disparities between clerical poverty and, what one may euphemistically call, clerical affluence do not make for clerical fellowship or express Christian community. . . . Thirdly, inequalities between benefices result in livings often being considered "important" for irrelevant reasons, and being sought after for wrong and unspiritual reasons.' The use of endowments results in a waste of man-power, it is argued. 'Man-power is concentrated most unequally and not at the strategic points. In one place five men may be stationed where two would suffice, and in another only one where five are needed. The new housing areas where a sense of community has gradually to be created are points where in the early years the church should be able to concentrate its effective clergy and lay workers in large numbers so that the community sense in these areas may have a chance of growing around a centre of spiritual life. The church is not doing that because it cannot for financial reasons so concentrate its man-power.'

This is a small book which surely requires the most careful attention. At the end we find Ten Propositions for reform clearly worked out. Those who are interested are asked to make themselves known to the correspondent in their own diocese.

'The Family.'

The Family is a novel of Russian exile life, and the author, Nina Fedorova, is to be congratulated on writing a delicate, unusual story with skilfully drawn characters. There were only five in the Family—Granny, Mother, a daughter and two nephews. It was ex-big, ex-great, ex-prosperous. Now the five lived at Tientsin and Mother kept a cheap boarding-house. But the Family was not unhappy. 'Life is hard in exile and poverty. But wonderful is the freedom of the human soul! And the Family was not chained to the pettiness of its humdrum existence. Tears and laughter, joy and sorrow, philosophy and a good joke—they had a generous share of everything.' It was not a home to which well-dressed English people came. Well-bred English girls would never be allowed by their parents to visit a poor Russian family. 'Why? Lida did not know, but she would never lay the fault at the door of the foreigners. Why should they be interested in her? . . . What could she show them if they should come to see her and her home? It was not their fault that she was born a Russian.' Peter was bitter at times. '"After twenty years of struggle, what remains of the Russians in exile? How many have died, degraded? We are finished by now. It is a fine time for us to say that no one has helped us. *They* let us alone."

'"My dear," said Granny gently, "do not talk like that. They are not obliged to help us."

'"Not obliged! Are they not Christians? In the whole of their foreign possessions they could not provide homes for one million Russian refugees, then all able to work. . . ."

'"My dear," Granny interrupted mildly, "in my youth—in the splendid house of my parents—I used to read sometimes in newspapers about the famines in India. We studied in geography also: one million of the population died yearly from famine. Well, what did *I* do about that? One comes to understanding through experience, only through suffering, I should say."'

The boarders are, as one would expect, a varied lot, a Chinese gentleman, five Japanese gentlemen, Mme. Militza, a professional fortune-teller, Professor Chernov, whose brilliant intellect is beginning to give way through his suffering, and his patient wife, Anna Petrovna, and the excitable Mrs. Parrish, a wealthy English lady who turned out to be a confirmed drunkard. 'All the attention of the Family was directed towards hindering her from buying liquors or preventing her drinking when she managed to get some.' Perhaps, after Granny herself, Mrs. Parrish is one of the best-drawn characters. After her cure by Granny's ceaseless efforts she meditates:

'How does it happen, she thought, that some people fail to tie anybody to themselves or to tie themselves to anybody, while others are centres of human joys, and pain, and affection . . . as Granny was before, as Mother is now? Why are some people like that? What makes them so? Suffering? But have I not suffered? Have I not? Yet my pain was evidently vain, it led me nowhere, taught me nothing. It never resulted in anything, but remained a pain which ate into all of my being. . . .

'Here, at Tientsin, she had been working for charity. Rummage sales, charity balls, Christmas presents for destitute children. In this way she had given thousands of dollars for the poor. . . . We have our methodical English way of helping, she thought. So wherein lies the difference? My heart had no part in it. . . . But is that necessary so long as I give money?

'Suddenly she felt a stab in her heart:

'And I, myself, was I in need of money when I was brought here? Could money save me? . . .

'It was not for my money that Granny nursed me as if I were her own child. Yes, yes, beside the ordinary relations between people—that of being brothers, sisters, husbands, wives, children—there is another kind—the ties of charity, of sympathy, of pity . . . and those ties bind people into another kind of group, a Family in spirit.'

Prayer.

'Granny knew only one cure for all the misery which could befall a human being, and this was prayer.' . . .

'Slowly Granny dressed and went to church. As usual, she left the house dull and tired, and came back serene and calm, with a radiant face. . . . It was not, in fact, a real church building; it was only a room extremely poor, adapted for church services. The priest was a Chinese, who came from a family of martyrs to the Christian faith. Humbly and ardently they prayed. None but the poor, the old, and invalids came to that church. Not many candles were lit, for those people had no worldly goods to offer their God; they had no gold, no silver—all they could give was their faith, their devotion buried deeply in the silence of their souls, brought to that last refuge through all the trials of life—through blood, pain, tears. And the same Christ who used to look down at Granny in Russia from golden frames, wearing a pearly crown, whose body was then beautified with diamonds, sapphires, and rubies in those splendid churches of the past, the same, the *only* Christ, now looked down from the poor wooden-and-paper icons, freed from jewellery—and He was the same. In this ever-changing world only He remained the same. And He spoke to Granny the same words of encouragement and consolation, gave the same promises, and from the inexhaustible source of His love she drank gladly and freely. And the source never failed, but was open to all who deigned to stoop and drink.'[1]

J. M. Barrie and Princess Margaret.

After closing *The Story of J. M. B.*, by Denis Mackail, one is left uncertain about a number of things but never about Barrie's love for small children. Let us retell—so that it may be told in turn to other children—what happened on Princess Margaret's third birthday at Glamis. Barrie had the privilege of sitting beside her at tea. Some of her presents were on the table, 'and they seemed to me,' he wrote afterwards, for one of Cynthia's books, *The King's Daughters*, 'to be as simple things that might have come from sixpenny shops, but she was in a frenzy of glee about them, especially about one to which she had given the place of honour by her plate. I said to her as one astounded:

'"Is that really your very own?"

'And she saw how I envied her, and immediately placed it between us with the words:

'"It is yours *and* mine."'

Words not likely to be forgotten; least of all when they came from a Princess on her third birthday. But in these two days Barrie had put his spell on both the royal children; and again there was

[1] Nina Fedorova, *The Family*, 116 f.

another phrase that came back to him from the younger. His name had been mentioned, and instantly she had said : 'I know that man. He is my greatest friend, and I am *his* greatest friend.' . . . Those words of hers—'It is yours *and* mine' —and what she had said afterwards—'He is my greatest friend, and I am *his* greatest friend'—had both been spoken again at every performance of *The Boy David*. Quite early in its history, at another meeting with the real author, Barrie had confessed this act of plagiarism ; and just as he had once made that royalty arrangement with Jack Llewelyn Davies for the line that he had used in *Little Mary*, so now he had told Princess Margaret that she should have a penny for each time that each of her two phrases was spoken from the stage.

'She hadn't forgotten this. And now it appeared that her father, His Majesty the King, had known of the offer and hadn't forgotten it, either. A message reached Barrie at the beginning of March—a kind and human message from one with the heaviest burden of all—that if he didn't take steps to carry out his promise, he would be hearing from His Majesty's solicitors. So this was the gleam, and rather more than a gleam.' A bag of bright new pennies was got from the bank. A proper agreement was drawn up by Barrie's own solicitor, but by this time Barrie was seriously ill. He was not able to deliver the bag. 'Their Majesties the King and Queen had transmitted their inquiries and sympathy, and the Queen, with royal thoughtfulness, had arranged for the indenture to be countersigned by Princess Margaret, and sent around to the nursing-home.'

Religious Education.

'It was nearly bedtime in the shelter and my gifted colleague, T. C. Baird, was making a "round" of the sections and chatting with the people before they turned in. For more than three months this young minister—still a probationer—has been padre of his own shelter, and meeting, together with Mrs. Hornabrook, the shelter "mother," the complex problems of a family which has varied from seven hundred to a thousand people every night.

'He was accosted by a young man. Prayers had just been said and it is possible that evening devotions had turned the thought of the fellow towards divine things. "Do you believe in God, sir ?" he asked.

'The question was rather odd, I suppose, addressed to a man who had just been engaged in public prayer, and who had slept every night among them with a clerical collar on, but he answered quite simply, "Why, yes, of course."

'"But there are many queer things about life and religion it's 'ard to understand," the young fellow said.

'"There are," assented the padre. "But if you get the heart of religion right, the rest of it falls into place . . . and the heart of it is Jesus Christ."

'The young fellow leaned against his bunk and said, "I've 'eard of Him."

'"Of course you have," said a kindly woman standing by. "He was the Son of Mary."

'"Why, yes," he responded, with eager understanding, obviously glad to be keeping in the conversation. "And Noah's Ark was His uncle."

'There was not a shadow of a smile on his face, nor had he the slightest idea that he was in error. He is about thirty-two years of age, is married, and has two children. To all appearances he would pass as a typical friendly shelterer.

'I discussed the point recently with my neighbour, Canon F. R. Barry, the author of *The Relevance of Christianity*. We agreed that the title of this fine book would be a joke in shelterland. Few things more irrelevant than Christianity in the thought of most of my new friends it would be hard to find.' [1]

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch.

A number of readers have drawn our attention to the unfortunate error in the Notes of Recent Exposition last month. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch is King Edward VII. Professor of English Literature in the University of Cambridge.

[1] W. E. Sangster, in *The Methodist Recorder*, 22nd May 1941.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.